



TERESA JORDAN  
3152 SHAD COURT  
SIMI VALLEY, CA 93063  
TELEPHONE NO. (805) 522-5016

TO: Ms. Tracy Woods  
LARWQCB  
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90013

FAX NO.: (213) 576-6640

DATE: April 9, 2009

NO. OF PAGES: 21 (includes cover sheet)

RE: Amended Tentative Order for the Ventura  
Countywide Municipal Separate Storm Sewer  
System (MSS) NPDES No. CA5004002 Permit.

3152 Shad Court  
Simi Valley, CA 93063  
April 9, 2009

Ms. Tracy Woods  
LARWQCB  
320 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Re: Amended Tentative Order for the Ventura Countywide  
Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) NPDES  
No. CAS004002 Permit.

Dear Ms. Woods:

This letter is a follow-up to my April 8, 2009 letter on  
the aforementioned subject.

TENTATIVE ORDER 09-XXXX (Continued)

- #5 - Page 14 of 121, number 13, it is stated "The following beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan apply to all or portions of each watershed covered by this Order:..." When the April 2, 2009 Board Triennial Review Workshop information was posted on the Website (March 2, 2009), my comments were excluded from the original "Attachment to Notice: Inventory of Basin Plan Issues Raised by Stakeholders in Fall 2008 Solicitation". My comments were finally included in the Revised Document (Inventory) -- posted on the Website March 27, 2009.
  
- #6 - Page 23 of 121, number 6, it is stated "This Order promotes land development and redevelopment strategies that consider water quality and water management benefits associated with smart growth techniques. Such measures may include hydromodification mitigation requirements, minimization of impervious surfaces, integrated water resources planning, and low impact development guidelines..." Yet under number 9, on Page 24 of 121, it is stated "This Order contemplates that the Permittees are responsible

for considering potential storm water impacts when making planning decisions in order to fulfill the Permittees' CWA requirement to reduce the discharge of pollutants in municipal storm water to the MEP and attain water quality objectives from new development and redevelopment activities." These statements are contradictory.

It is stated under number 2, on Page 65 of 121, that "General Plan Update (a) Each Permittee shall amend, revise or update its General Plan to include watershed and storm water quality and quantity management considerations and policies when any of the following General Plan elements are updated or amended: (1) Land Use (2) Housing (3) Conservation (4) Open Space (b) Each Permittee shall provide the Regional Water Board with the draft amendment or revision when a listed General Plan element or General Plan is noticed for comment in accordance with Cal. Govt. Code S 65350 et seq."

According to the March 3, 2009 Ventura County Watershed Protection District Board of Supervisors' meeting approved Ventura Countywide Stormwater Quality Management Program, NPDES Permit NO. CAS004002, Annual Report, Page 5-6 --General Plan Revisions chart:

<u>CO-PERMITTEE</u>	<u>GP DATE</u>	<u>GP REWRITE</u>
Camarillo	10/2003	*
Ventura County	10/1997	Blank
Fillmore	4/2003	*
Moorpark	1/1984	N/A
Ojai	5/1997	*
Oxnard	1/1990	2009
Port Hueneme	8/1997	2015
Ventura	8/2005	*
Santa Paula	1/1998	2009
Simi Valley	10/1988	12/1/2009
Thousand Oaks	7/1996	2019 *

\* "Plan already updated to include stormwater".

California Government Code Section 65040.5(a) states "The office shall notify a city or county with a general plan that has not been revised within eight years". Clearly, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has violated State law.

California Government Code Section 65040.5(b) states "The office shall notify the Attorney General if a general plan of a city or county has not been revised within ten years". The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has clearly violated State law.

Therefore, I do not believe that what is stated in the Section E. Planning and Land Development Program pages will be accomplished.

- #7 - Page 33 of 121, PART 2 - MUNICIPAL ACTION LEVELS, numbers "1.", "2.", and "3." sound great until read "4." (Page 34 of 121) which says "Beginning Year 3 after Order adoption date, each Permittees shall submit a MAL Action Plan with the Annual Report (first MAL Action Plan due with Dec. 15, 2011 Annual Report) to the Executive Officer, for those subwatersheds with a running average of twenty percent or greater of exceedances of the MALs in any discharge of storm water from the MS4 to waters of the U.S." Year 1!!!

It is stated on Page 10 of 64, of the January 30, 2009 Boeing submitted ROWD documentation, that "The Expert Panel has been convened and has recommended a system of natural and engineered BMPs for both outfalls. Some of the BMPs are now in construction but others cannot be completed at this time due to the need to obtain a modification to the Special Use Permit for SSFL from the County of Ventura. Ventura County has determined that the modification of the Special Use Permit is an action subject to review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Boeing is proceeding with an application for the Special Use Permit modification required for the ENTS project and Ventura County will be conducting the appropriate CEQA review." Outfalls 008 and 009

were "grouped" with outfalls 003 through 010 in order to use outfalls 003 through 007 (Arroyo Simi is the receiving waterbody)'s effluent limits benchmarks until "June 14, 2009" (Boeing's current NPDES permit expiration date).

The August 11, 2008 City of Simi Valley's Board of Directors of the Ventura County Waterworks District No. 8 meeting staff report for the agenda item Approval of Payment to the Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County stated on Page 1 "The agencies have been negotiating a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to formalize the WCVC. While the MOA is not ready to be recommended for Board consideration, the WCVC has continued to work on the tasks provided in the budget, and the costs share request is appropriate."

The October 28, 2008 Ventura County Watershed Protection District Board of Supervisors' meeting staff report on the Memorandum of Understanding between Ventura County and the County Watershed Protection District to participate in the WCVC's IRWMP efforts states "The Watersheds Coalition of Ventura County has been operating since April of 2006 as the 'regional water management group' overseeing and coordinating the ongoing IRWMP process. However, many of the partnering agencies, including the Watershed Protection District were still participating under the previous MOU for the former Ventura Countywide IRWMP." The October 28, 2008 Ventura County Waterworks District No. 16 Board of Supervisors' meeting staff report on the Memorandum of Understanding between the County of Ventura and Ventura County Waterworks District No. 16 to participate in the WCVC's IRWMP efforts states "The WCVC has been operating since April of 2006 as the 'regional water management group' overseeing and coordinating the ongoing IRWMP process. However, many of the partnering agencies, including Ventura County Waterworks District Nos. 1, 16, and 19, were still participating under the previous MOU for the former Ventura Countywide IRWMP."

This participation by many of the partnering agencies under the former Ventura Countywide IRWMP is inexcusable, and it is mind boggling that the County Counsel, County Auditor-Controller's Office, and Office of the County Executive Officer, as well as the law firm providing legal services on the District's Ventura Countywide Stormwater Program Permit didn't have this matter dealt with ASAP in light of the millions of dollars in State IRWM Grant Program funds allocated toward local projects. This is oversight, whether deliberate or not was unfair to other entities whose projects were turned down at the funding round as the WCVC application was submitted and approved. This matter also impacts the submittal process for the State Department of Water Resources Final Integrated Regional Water Management Region Acceptance Process submittals since this involves "Region Water Management Groups" (DWR March 11, 2009 Press Release)

#8 - Page 23 of 121, number 7, it is stated "The implementation of an effective Public Information and Participation Program is a critical component of a storm water management program...the general public, in comparison, receives significantly less education in environmental protection. An effective Public Information and Participation Program is required because: (a) Activities conducted by the public such as vehicle maintenance, improper household waste materials disposal, improper pet waste disposal and the improper application of fertilizers and pesticides have the potential to generate a significant amount of pollutants that could be discharged in storm water. (b) An increase in public knowledge of storm water regulations, proper storage and disposal of household wastes, proper disposal of pet wastes and appropriate home vehicle maintenance practices can lead to a significant reduction of pollutants discharged in storm water." I agree, but more needs to be done such as holding workshops on vehicle maintenance good housekeeping--men and women, no matter the age love their automobiles and

love to maintain them since trust of repair shops (independent or auto dealers) is lacking.

Also, on Page 41 of 121, under Section C. Public Information and Participation Program (PIPP) add Section "(d)" requiring that all Permittees hold public hearings on amendments to the 1992 NPDES

Permit Implementation Agreement, Legislative actions to amend the Ventura County Watershed Protection District (formerly Ventura County Flood Control District) Act, and all future proposed Prop 218 NPDES program permit fee related initiatives. Biased newspaper stories serve the purpose to generate fear instead of disclosing all of the facts. Also if a Prop 218 voter initiative is issued if the issuer is a government entity, or member of the WCVC, or the WCVC itself, ballot language must disclose the existing fraudulent assessment fees since public hearings at the cities level did not take place back in 1992, and the 2008 and 2009 amendments have also not gone through public hearings. I make the request in light of Section (8), on Page 43 of 121, which states "The Permittees shall develop and implement a behavioral change assessment strategy no later than (365 days after the Order adoption date), in order to determine whether the PIPP is demonstrably effective in changing the behavior of the public. The strategy shall be developed based on current sociological data and studies." that behavioral change can be taken as making real positive changes to people's activities, or to generate support in order to cover up any discharger's illegal activities--funding, projects, back door deals, etceteras.

- #9 - Pages 51 and 52 of 121, to Section 4. Interagency Coordination add something to the effect of "Investigation of Complaints Regarding Permittees".
- #10 - Page 52 of 121, to Section 4. Interagency Coordination add Section "(f)" Coordinate or Host a General Industrial Permit Training Workshop. The Permittees shall work with the

RWQCB staff--this information was included on Page 4-5 of the March 3, 2009 Ventura County Watershed Protection District Board of Supervisors' Ventura Countywide Stormwater Quality Management Program, NPDES Permit NO. CAS004002, Annual Report: Permit Year 8/ Reporting Year 14 and Implications of Future Stormwater Requirements.

- #11 - Throughout the draft amended Ventura Countywide MS4 NPDES permit, the Board's Executive Officer makes determinations, changes, etceteras. To date the Board Website Calendar's Agenda and Meetings sections have not been updated to reflect Year 2009 items. The Meetings Website section does not include the Board's February 2009 meeting--when new Chair and Vice Chair were voted in. The Agenda Website section does not include the 2009 Calendar. The "Ex Parte Communications" State law that the Executive Officer said in her February 9, 2009 letter said I flagrantly and improperly disregarded with my 2008 and 2009 letters on the draft Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements-General NPDES Permit for Discharges from Potable Water Distribution and Water Supply Systems to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties is perplexing in light of the fact that dischargers communicate with Board members. For example: the November 13, 2008 (NOTE: the original letter is erroneously dated 2009) from former Chairperson Francine Diamond to Ventura County Board of Supervisors' Chairman Peter Foy on postponement of the December 10, 2008 workshop on the draft municipal stormwater permit for Ventura County (NPDES No. CAS004002). Thus, all of my comments in my letters on this subject should have been responded to and included in the staff's responses posted on the Board's Website due to Permit deficiencies.
- #12 - To date the Tentative Orders for the Cities of Thousand Oaks, and the Camarillo Sanitary District WDRs have not been rescheduled for a Board meeting, nor have the submitted comments, and responses on the Draft documents been posted on the Board's Website.

Ms. Woods, please note that on Page 2 (TENTATIVE ORDER 09-XXXX, Comment #2) of my April 8, 2009 letter the Boeing "Permit-by-Rule" information is found in the currently proposed Amended NPDES No. CA0001309 (ORDER No. R4-2009-00XX Tentative Order document), number 16, on bottom of Page 4 and top of Page 5--"In the future, Boeing plans to treat effluent from SSFL groundwater remediation operations in either a mobile or fixed hazardous waste treatment unit operating under DTSC Permit-by-Rule requirements". Please note that "of" is in error. The correction is "or".

Ms. Woods, please note that on Page 1, end of paragraph, of my April 8, 2009 letter my "former letters submitted on this subject" on the Ventura Countywide MS4 NPDES permit are dated September 17, 2007, and May 27 and May 28, 2008.

Ms. Woods, please note that on Page 2 (TENTATIVE ORDER 09-XXXX, Comment #1) of my April 8, 2009 letter the "Nava" bill information is AB 554 (Karnette/Nava, signed by Governor Schwarzenegger on October 4, 2005), and AB 1003 (Nava, vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger on July 26, 2005).

Ms. Woods, I still have a considerable amount of comments to submit on the amended Tentative Order and related NPDES Permit documents. I will be forwarding a follow-up letter ASAP to meet the deadline.

Sincerely,



Mrs. Teresa Jordan

Enclosures:

April 2, 2009, Teresa Jordan Summary of December 29, 2008 Letter on TENTATIVE WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS-GENERAL NPDES PERMIT FOR DISCHARGES FROM POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION AND WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS TO SURFACE WATERS IN COASTAL WATERSHEDS OF LOS ANGELES AND VENTURA COUNTIES (GENERAL NPDESS NO. CAG994005). (4 Pages).

April 2, 2009, Teresa Jordan Summary of January 2, 2009 Letter on GENERAL NPDES PERMIT NO. CAG994005

(Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from Potable Water Distribution and Water Supply Systems to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles & Ventura Counties Watersheds).  
(4 Pages)

April 2, 2009, Teresa Jordan Summary of January 28, 2009 Letter on ORDER NO. R4-2009-XXX, WDRs FOR DISCHARGES FROM POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION AND WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS TO SURFACE WATERS IN COASTAL WATERSHEDS OF LOS ANGELES AND VENTURA COUNTIES (GENERAL NPDES PERMIT NO. CAG994005). (3 Pages)

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
TENTATIVE WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS - GENERAL  
NPDES PERMIT FOR DISCHARGES FROM POTABLE WATER  
DISTRIBUTION AND WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS TO SURFACE  
WATERS IN COASTAL WATERSHEDS OF LOS ANGELES AND  
VENTURA COUNTIES (GENERAL NPDES NO. CAG994005)

Summary of Teresa Jordan Comments

Letter Submitted on December 29, 2008

[Public Comments Deadline: January 30, 2009]

DECEMBER 24, 2008 NOTICE TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES

- #1 - The pages are not numbered.
- #2 - Page 2, "cc" list, the name of the entity "Ventura County Department of Public Works, Flood Control and Drainage" is incorrect. The correction is the Ventura County Watershed Protection District. For months, I have tried to have Board staff make the corrections, but for whatever reason this inaccuracy keeps popping up in the "Mailing List" for Board agendized issues.
- #3 - Pages 2 through 4, the Ventura County Cities of Fillmore, Moorpark, Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, Simi Valley, and San Buenaventura (Ventura are not included on the "cc" list.
- #4 - Page 4, "All enrollees under the general NPDES permit for Discharge of Groundwater from Potable Water Supply Wells to Surface Waters" must be named in the "cc" list, not lumped this way.
- #5 - Pages 2 and 3, the entity Calleguas Municipal Water District is listed twice under "cc" (Page 2, Donald R. Kendall; and Page 3, Don Kendall).

ATTACHMENT F - FACT SHEET

- #1 - Page F-34, Section IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, B. Written Comments, all submittal tools were not

included. Facsimile, e-mail, and courier service submittals must also be accepted. Otherwise, the public participation process is being limited.

- #2 - Page F-35, Section F Public Comments and Submittal of Evidence, "." is missing after "F".
- #3 - Page F-35, Section F. Public Comments and Submittal of Evidence, last sentence, I am opposed to the statement "...if the Board receives only supportive comments, the permit may be placed on the Board's consent calendar, and approved without an oral testimony".

#### ATTACHMENT B - WATERSHED/STREAM WASTEWATER DISCHARGE

- #1 - Page 1, number 7 (Los Angeles River Watershed), "a" is separated from "b" through "e" with the words Los Angeles River Watershed(continued).
- #2 - Page 1, number 5, it is stated under Miscellaneous Los Angeles County Coastal Streams that "no waterbody specific limits", yet under "a" (Malibu Creek Watershed) specific limits are given for TDS, Sulfate, Chloride, Boron, and Nitrogen.

#### ATTACHMENT D - FEDERAL STANDARD PROVISIONS

- #1 - Page 2, Section G.1, "Definitions" indent error.
- #2 - Page 2, Section G.1.a, indent error.
- #3 - Page 3, Section G.5, "Notice" indent error.
- #4 - Page 4, "Provisions - Reporting V.E. below..." indent error.
- #5 - Page 5, Section III, "STANDARD" indent error.
- #6 - Page 5, Section III.A and B, spacing error.

- #7 - Page 6, Section IV.A, spacing error between "five" and "years".
- #8 - Page 6, Sections IV.A and B, spacing error.
- #9 - Page 6, Sections IV.B.3, 4, and 5, "The" indent errors.
- #10 - Page 6, Section IV.C and 1, spacing error.
- #11 - Page 6, Section V.A, "Duty" spacing error.
- #12 - Page 7, Section V.B.2, "All" indent error.
- #13 - Page 7, Section V.B.2.c, I disagree with the either/or option for the Signatory and Certification requirement for a municipality. Due to the Ventura Countywide 1992 NPDES Permit 1992 Implementation Agreement(s) and 2008 amendment debacle (no public hearings on assessment fees), the ranking elected official must sign all permit applications.
- #14 - Page 8, Section V.B.5, "5" indent error.
- #15 - Page 11, Section VI, "STANDARD" indent error.
- #16 - Page 12, Section VI, spacing errors between "A" and "B", "B" and "C", and "C" and "D".
- #17 - Page 13, Section VII.A.1.a, "100" indent error.
- #18 - Page 13, Section VII.A.1.c, indent error.
- #19 - Page 13, Section VII.A.2.a, "500" indent error.
- #20 - Page 13, Section VII.A.a, error. It is # "3".
- #21 - Page 13, "Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) (Not Applicable) is Section VII.B.

ATTACHMENT E - SAMPLE MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

- #1 - The statement "The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Water Board have classified this discharge as a minor discharge"

is premature in light of the Boeing Company's (formerly Rockwell International) Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) property--formerly the Rocketdyne site--ground contamination which impacts the Calleguas Creek Watershed area, the City of Simi Valley's Municipal NPDES permit, and the Ventura Countywide MS4 NPDES permit.

According to SECTION 1.c of AB 1842 (Smyth, Amended)--the proposed Santa Susana State Park on the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) area-- "Testing done at the site had the great misfortune of contaminating the ground, causing the property to become a source of regional controversy..." According to SECTION 1.d of Amended AB 1842, "...the importance of applying appropriate land use protocols in order to avoid contamination of sensitive ecosystems in the future".

[NOTE: Compiled by Teresa Jordan on April 2, 2009.]

## LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

GENERAL NPDES PERMIT NO. CAG994005 (Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from Potable Water Distribution and Water Supply Systems to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties)

## Summary of Teresa Jordan Comments

Letter Submitted on January 2, 2009

[Public Comments Deadline: January 30, 2009]

Follow-up letter to my December 29, 2008 letter.

ATTACHMENT E - SAMPLE MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM  
(Continued)

- #1 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral II, the "DISCHARGES" line is not indented correctly.
- #2 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral II, Sections "A.", "B.", and "C." must be indented the same as the "EFFLUENT" line.
- #3 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral III, "Effluent Monitoring Requirement FOR WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM DISCHARGES" must have "Effluent Monitoring Requirement" capitalized.
- #4 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral III, Sections "A.", "B.", and "C." must be indented the same as the "Effluent"(EFFLUENT) line.
- #5 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral IV, the "SYSTEM" line is not indented correctly.
- #6 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral IV, Sections "A.", "B.", and "C." must be indented the same as the "WHOLE" line.
- #7 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral VI, the "RECLAMATION" line is not indented correctly.

- #8 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral VII, the "GROUNDWATER" line is not indented correctly.
- #9 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, Roman numeral IX, Sections "A.", "B.", and "C." must be indented the same as the "REPORTING" line.
- #10 - Page 1, LIST OF TABLES, center for consistency purposes as was done with TABLE OF CONTENTS.
- #11 - Page 1, LIST OF TABLES, Table 2 is missing a ".".
- #12 - Page 1, LIST OF TABLES, indent the subjects in Tables 1 to 5 to align with each other.
- #13 - Pages 2 to 5, "A." through "S.", print in bold letters to be consistent with the rest of the document.
- #14 - Page 5, "R.", have "SAMPLE COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS (AS APPROPRIATE)" in lower case lettering, and in bold print.
- #15 - Page 5, Section II.B. Table 1, indent the title to be consistent with the other Tables.
- #16 - Page 6, Section II.C, Table 2 is missing a ".".
- #17 - Page 6, Section III.A, indent Table 3 to be consistent with the other Tables.
- #18 - Page 12, Section C, indent the sentence "No discharge of such chemical shall be made prior to obtaining the Executive Officer's approval" to be consistent with the sentence under "1."

#### TENTATIVE ORDER

- #1 - Page with Executive Officer Egoscue's statement; the Order adoption, effectiveness, and Report filing timelines; and the USEPA and Regional Water Board "minor discharge" statement; is the only page out of 33 posted that has the "I" in TENTATIVE aligned correctly.

- #2 - Page 1, TABLE OF CONTENTS, center for consistency purposes as was done with LIST OF TABLES and LIST OF ATTACHMENTS (Page 2).
- #3 - Page 2, Section VII.C, indent "Special" the same as the "Discharges" and "Monitoring" lines.
- #4 - Page 2, Section VIII.C, indent "Average" the same as the "Multiple" and "General" lines.
- #5 - Page 4, Section B, indent the "Water Supply Systems Discharge Enrollment Criteria" line with the "Water Supply Systems Discharge" line.
- #6 - Page 4, Section B, indent the paragraph that follows the "Water Supply Systems Discharge Enrollment Criteria" line with the "Water Supply Systems Discharge" line.
- #7 - Pages 4 and 5, Section B, change the "1." after the Water Supply Systems Enrollment Criteria paragraph to "a.", "2." to "b.", "3." to "c", "a)" to "i.", "b)" to "ii.", and "4" to "d.", and indent the lines accordingly.
- #8 - Page 6, Section III, indent the "Water Board), finds:" line the same as "The California" line.
- #9 - Page 7, Sections 5, 6, and 7, are incorrect. The correct numbering sequence is "4.", "5.", and "6.". Number 4 was skipped over.
- #10 - Page 12, Section E, add numbers "1." through "7." to differentiate the documents that are listed.
- #11 - Page 22, Section VII.A.2, "h." is incorrect. The correct lettering sequence is "g."
- #12 - Page 23, Section "i." is incorrect. The correct lettering sequence is "h."
- #13 - Page 24, the spacing is off between Sections "2." and "3."
- #14 - Page 25, the spacing is off between Sections "VIII" and "A.", "B.2" and "C.", and "C." and C's paragraph.

#15 - Page 26, the spacing is off between Sections "D." and "E.", and "F." and F's "Not Applicable" line.

It is mind boggling that Regional Water Board staff continues to make formatting errors when templates have been around for years to just simply follow through with. There simply are no excuses to have Regional Water Board Website visitors take precious time out to deal with formatting issues instead of what is being proposed. This simply shows that the Board is not wholeheartedly committed to the public participation process, or to training Water Board staff properly.

When a proposed NPDES permit is posted, have posted on the Board's Website the existing documentation for comparison purposes. A Website visitor must not have to search high and wide for the information elsewhere.

[NOTE: Compiled by Teresa Jordan on April 2, 2009.]

## LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

ORDER NO. R4-2009-XXXX, WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR DISCHARGES FROM POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION AND  
WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS TO SURFACE WATERS IN COASTAL  
WATERSHEDS OF LOS ANGELES AND VENTURA COUNTIES  
(GENERAL NPDES PERMIT NO. CAG994005)

## Summary of Teresa Jordan Comments

Letter Submitted on January 28, 2009

[Public Comments Deadline: January 30, 2009]

Follow-up letter to my December 29, 2009, and January 2,  
2009 letters. Opposed to Tentative Order No. R4-2009-XXXX  
(General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004).

TENTATIVE ORDER R4-2009-XXXX

#1 - Page 6, it is stated in Section III.A.1,  
Background, that "On August 7, 2003, the Regional  
Water Board adopted Order No. R4-2003-0108  
General NPDES Permit No. CAG994005,  
Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharge of  
Groundwater from Potable Water Supply Wells to  
Surface Waters. This General Permit expired on  
August 11, 2008, but is administratively extended  
until rescinded. Approximately 120 dischargers  
are enrolled under the General Permit. This  
Order now renews the requirements of this General  
Permit". Because the titles of ORDER NO. R4-2003  
-0108 (WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS for  
DISCHARGES OF GROUNDWATER FROM POTABLE WATER  
SUPPLY WELLS TO SURFACE WATERS IN COASTAL  
WATERSHEDS OF LOS ANGELES AND VENTURA COUNTIES),  
and Tentative Order No. R4-2009-XXXX (WASTE  
DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCHARGES FROM  
POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION AND WATER SUPPLY  
SYSTEMS TO SURFACE WATERS IN COASTAL WATERSHEDS  
OF LOS ANGELES AND VENTURA COUNTIES) are  
different, this is not the same General NPDES

Permit No. CAG994005. Thus, this is not a permit renewal, but a new permit.

- #2 - Page 7, while it is stated in Section III.A.5 that "General waste discharge requirements and NPDES permits enable Regional Water Board staff to expedite the processing of requirements, simplify the application process for dischargers, better utilize limited staff resources, and avoid" expenses, the real purpose of this proposed Tentative Order is to circumvent the "public noticing, hearings, and permit adoption" process!!!
- #3 - Page 7, the source of information is not given for the statement "Potable water has not been shown to be a source of pollution that would threaten or contribute to excursions above narrative and numeric water quality objectives contained in state and federal regulations. Potable water is considered to be a de minimus source of pollution".
- #4 - Groundwater, and Potable Water are not defined.
- #5 - Page 9, Section III.B.7, dischargers are exempt from effluent sampling requirements "during unplanned discharges where circumstances are beyond the Dischargers control".
- #6 - Page 9, Section III.B.8, "Planned potable water discharges of less than 100,000 gpd and unplanned discharges are exempt from sampling requirements if all of the following are met:..."
- #7 - Page 9, Section III.B.9, "Low volume discharge of potable water for the purpose of this permit less than 25,000 gallons per discharge event at a location is considered insignificant discharge and can proceed without coverage under the NPDES permit or a need to submit monitoring report..."
- #8 - Page 9, Section III.B.6(continuation), periodical calibration of chlorine measuring instruments and field test kits is being emphasized, not real statistical timelines.

#9 - This Order is not intended to "protect the most protective water quality objectives for the surface water beneficial uses in the Los Angeles Region" (Page 11, Section III.C.8).

#10 - Page 3, Section I, "minor reservoir releases" and "minor well releases" are not clarified.

#### DELETIONS

1. Page 5, Section II.C.1, delete the word "highly" from the "Groundwater highly contaminated with drilling mud and/or well completion fluids" statement.
2. Page 5, Section II.C.1, delete the word "should" from the "Such contaminated water should be disposed separately at appropriate location" statement, and change it to "must".
3. Page 5, Section II.C.1, delete the word "appropriate" from the "Such contaminated water must be disposed separately at appropriate location" statement, and change it to "permitted".
4. Page 6, Section II.D, delete "30 days" from the "Coverage under this Order...statement and change it to "45 days".
5. Page 9, top of page, delete the word "filed" from the "Chlorine measuring instruments and filed test kits shall be calibrated periodically to assure accuracy of measurements" statement, and change it to "field".

[NOTE: Compiled by Teresa Jordan on April 2, 2009.]