Genera, Sue@Waterboards

From: Andrew Hall <ahall@lacsd.org>
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 12:05 PM
To: Curtis, Chuck@Waterboards
Subject: RE: LACSD 20 CAO

Chuck,
That is correct. Thanks for the confirmation and the response letter. Let me know if there is anything else that we can do to help.
Andrew

From: Curtis, Chuck@Waterboards [mailto:CCurtis@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 11:49 AM
To: Hall, Andrew
Subject: RE: LACSD 20 CAO

Thanks, Andrew.
The formatting in your email appeared to remove some decimal points in the concentrations you corrected. Please confirm that the values in Table 1 for DW4-2 for 2008 is 2.4 and MW-32 for 2006 is 0.57 (the same value as 2007 and 2008), and in Table 2 for MW-4 is 14.9 for 2008 and 14.8 for 2009.

Regarding comments from others, I sent out today the attached letter to Nebeker regarding his April comments. Other than LAWA's earlier indication that they were opposed to our naming them as a responsible party and not apportioning them secondary responsibility, I have not received any comments.

Be aware that the Water Board's advisory team will likely put out hearing procedures that will identify when any information from the dischargers or interested parties must be submitted to them for consideration at the hearing. The comment deadline in my notice was so I may consider any needed changes in the order before bringing it to the Water Board for consideration.

Thanks,
Chuck

From: Andrew Hall [mailto:ahall@lacsd.org]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 11:09 AM
To: Curtis, Chuck@Waterboards
Subject: RE: LACSD 20 CAO

Chuck,
Here are the minor things we noticed:
Finding 12 on page 7. Suggest that the second to last sentence in second paragraph be changed to, "In addition, MW-23 is downgradient from LACSD's 40th Street East oxidation ponds, which may also **have been** a source of nitrate to the groundwater." The ponds are no longer in service, so past tense seems to make sense here.

Table 1:
DW4-2: The 2008 concentration should be 24
MW-32: The 2006 concentration should be 057

Table 2:
MW-4: The 2008 concentration should be 149 and the 2009 concentration should be 14.8

As I had mentioned before, aside from these minor changes, we don't have any major concerns with the CAO at this time.

Also, have you heard from any others regarding the proposed CAO(e.g., LAWA/Nebeker)? And how is the response letter coming for the earlier Nebeker letter? Thanks!
Andrew

From: Curtis, Chuck@Waterboards [mailto:CCurtis@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 10:25 AM
To: Hall, Andrew
Subject: LACSD 20 CAO

Andrew,
You can email me your comments/corrections on the CAO.
Thanks,
Chuck

Chuck Curtis, PE
Supervising Water Resource Control Engineer
Manager, Regulatory Compliance Division
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd., South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
Ph.: 530 542-5460
Fax: 530 542-5470
Mobile: 530 721-2192