

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**  
**GENERAL WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS**  
**ORDER NO. R3-2020-0001**  
**FOR**  
**ACTIVE CLASS III LANDFILLS IN THE CENTRAL COAST REGION**

Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Coast Water Board) staff provided an opportunity for the public to review and provide early input and submit written comments on the draft General Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R3-2020-0001 for Active Class III Landfills in the Central Coast Region (referred to as draft General Order). This document describes the public input process and contains Central Coast Water Board staff's responses to the written comments received on the draft General Order during the public comment period. Staff considered all comments received during the public input process to prepare the proposed General Order.

**Early Outreach**

Central Coast Water Board staff conducted early outreach to inform stakeholders about the plan to develop the proposed General Order and to invite early input from the regulated community. On October 30, 2019, Central Coast Water Board staff circulated a "preliminary" draft General Order (referred to as preliminary draft) for review and comment to interested persons, including representatives from the land disposal industry and environmental organizations. A preliminary draft review process is not required; however Central Coast Water Board provided an early opportunity for landfill operators to provide input to the process to ensure a thorough review.

In response to the preliminary draft, the Central Coast Water Board received comments from the following six interested persons:

- James Wyse, President, Pacific Waste Services, Inc., City of Paso Robles Landfill Contract Operator
- Kasey Kolassa, Recycling and Solid Waste Services Manager, County of Santa Cruz (Conference Call)
- Brian Pierskalla, Sr. Env. Scientist, Camp Roberts
- Herb Cantu, Solid Waste Manager, City of Santa Maria
- Jeff Clarin, District Manager, Waste Connections
- Melissa Nelson, Registered Geologist, County of Santa Barbara

Preliminary comments focused on errors and corrections, requirement clarifications, new requirement concerns (e.g., lined drainages), and specific monitoring additions and concerns (e.g., inorganics, stormwater, leachate system, and landfill gas). In many cases, Central Coast Water Board staff followed up with commenters to clarify the comments and discuss options to address areas of concern. Central Coast Water Board staff did not develop written responses to comments on the preliminary draft, however comments received on the preliminary draft were used by staff to develop the draft General Order. The City of Paso Robles included their comments on the preliminary draft with their 30-day draft General Order comments. Therefore, this response to

comments includes the City of Paso Robles's resubmitted preliminary draft comments and indicates where the preliminary draft comments were addressed in the draft General Order. In many cases, the City of Paso Robles confirmed that their specific comments on the preliminary draft were addressed in the draft General Order.

### **Response to Written Comments**

Central Coast Water Board staff released the draft General Order for a 30-day public comment period starting on June 26, 2020 and ending on July 29, 2020. A copy of the public notice and draft General Order are available on the Central Coast Water Board's website<sup>1</sup>. In response to the public comment period, the Central Coast Water Board received written comments from the following eight interested persons:

- James Wyse, President, Pacific Waste Services, Inc., Paso Robles Landfill Contract Operator
- Mike Rivera, Solid Waste Division Manager, City of Watsonville
- Matt Machado, Deputy CAO, Director of Public Works, County of Santa Cruz
- Patrick Matthews, General Manager/CAO, Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority
- Kent B. Harrison, Commander, California State Guard, Director of Public Works, Camp Roberts
- Jim Throop, City Manager, City of Lompoc
- Herb Cantu, Solid Waste Manager, City of Santa Maria
- Rick Mitchell, Principal Engineering Geologist, RMC Geoscience, Inc (Comments compiled from multiple parties on behalf of Waste Connections)

Central Coast Water Board staff considered the comments received on the draft General Order to develop the proposed General Order and prepared a formal response to comments. The responses to the written comments received are provided below. Please note that in some cases the numbering referenced in the written comments have since been revised and are no longer accurate. Staff included the comment(s) as written by the commenter with only minor edits for clarification and grammatical clarity purposes. However, staff included the correct numbering in the response, when appropriate.

The individual comment letters are available to download at:

<https://ftp.waterboards.ca.gov/?u=public&p=password>

### **Pacific Waste Services – City of Paso Robles Landfill**

**Paso Robles Comment 1** – [In 10/30/2019 preliminary draft] there appears to be no reference in the introductory letter or “COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER REGULATIONS” on pages 1 and 2 to new Short Lived Climate Pollutants (SLCP): Organic Waste

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/board\\_decisions/tentative\\_orders/](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/board_decisions/tentative_orders/)

Reductions (started by SB1383) regulations being considered by CalRecycle and expected for adoption by the end of 2019. The SLCP contains 163 pages of new and changes to Title 14 and Title 27 which have impacts on active landfills. It is possible that the new SLCP regulations may have been considered in Attachment B – Additional Findings 47 mentions reduction of methane emissions from landfills and wanted to confirm these new SLCP regulations have been considered.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment C. Finding 67. And 68. addresses the SLCP regulations. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the commenter was satisfied that the comment was addressed in the June 26, 2020 draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 2** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Prohibition 1, Closed WMUs, the recirculation or application of leachate is accepted as provided in Specification 13. Will the recirculation of leachate into the WMU require a pilot study, design or special engineered alternative approval for this method and site-specific description of Specification 13?

The 6/26/2020 Draft changed the Specification No. to C.14 which identifies that the next JTD shall identify proposed method of leachate/condensate handling and require Executive Officer approval. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 3** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Prohibition 2, Historically, only certain landfill sites were permitted to accept “Treated Wood Waste” for disposal which Paso Robles Landfill is one of those facilities. Is there a change to allow all landfills to accept Treated Wood Wastes?

The 6/26/2020 Draft requires acceptance for disposal of treated wood waste with compliance with C.24 requirement. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 4** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Specification 9 is a new requirement; lined drainage ditches (1-foot thick < 1 x 10<sup>-6</sup> cm/sec) that have been inactive for one year to prevent erosion and percolation through waste. Such requirement will require testing existing drainage ditches, likely ditch reconstruction, design/propose engineered alternative, or pursuit of Partial Final Closure.

The 6/26/2020 Draft had no changes to this new requirement (Specification C.9). This new requirement and compliance will be covered in the next JTD for the Paso Robles Landfill.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Lining draining ditches will be a new requirement for the City of Paso Robles, but it is a requirement that is included in some existing landfill individual waste discharge requirements (WDRs). The specification is intended to prevent stormwater from infiltrating into waste and to help prevent erosion into waste and sediment discharge to stormwater. Infiltration of stormwater into waste generates additional leachate that can result in leachate seeps at the bottom of slopes below bench drainages, which can be difficult to correct and contain to prevent impacts to stormwater. Regarding drainage liner construction, the proposed General Order does not require the stringent construction quality assurance (CQA) that is required for primary waste management unit (WMU) containment features (i.e., WMU base and slope bottom liners and final covers) pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 27, §20324. Staff revised the proposed General Order Provision F.16 to clarify that construction of WMU liners or final covers requires CQA. Although drainage liner CQA pursuant to CCR, title 27, is not required, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) similar to what is required by Provision F.18 for operations layer or protective cover soil placement may be required by the Executive Officer as a condition of an approved alternative. QA/QC is less rigorous than CQA and can be performed by appropriate onsite personnel and tailored to the project's scale and potential impacts. Staff left the requirement to line drainage ditches to ensure consistency of regulation among the active landfills and to be protective of water quality.

**Paso Robles Comment 5** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Specification 13 for leachate and condensate discharge requirements appear generally the same. Do facilities need to apply, provide designs, etc. to the RWQCB to go through a pilot study process before securing approval of long-term leachate recirculation or can facilities prepare a permanent leachate recirculation plan for approval. Alternative condensate and leachate disposal at WWTP are not practical due to Industrial Waste Permit process, limits and required pre-treatment.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Specification C.14 covers this comment and the next JTD shall identify proposed method of leachate/condensate handling and require Executive Officer approval. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 6** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Specification 14. RWQCB approval of wet weather ADC use has already been approved for most Central Coast Region landfills. Is there a different path or submittal expected from landfills to secure this Specification described alternative daily cover [ADC] use during wet weather?

The 6/26/2020 Draft Specification C.15 covers this comment. Previous RWQCB approval of ADC use during wet season will be referenced in the next JTD submittal. No further comments.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 7** – Specification 24. Is this a new requirement. It appears that when the incoming sludge is > 50% moisture, that sludge must be handled on the lined landfill area. If sludge moisture is < 50% moisture, that sludge may be handled on an unlined sludge processing area. Is this RWQCB's intent? Historically, City's dewatered, secondary treated WWTP sludge is processed on an unlined processing area which is graded to drain into a closed watershed with no discharge off-site. The 6/26/2020 Draft Specification C.25 did not change the 10/30/2019 Draft Specification 24. Paso Robles Landfill has never co-disposed of Sludge with MSW. It appears that the Paso Robles Landfill will need to submit an engineered alternative to this requirement even though the Paso Robles Landfill has historically, processed City's WWTP biosolids (sludge) on permitted landfill footprint that lined Modules have not been developed yet and never co-disposed with MSW. The next JTD will offer engineered alternative for current methods of biosolids handling, processing and use. Furthermore, as Sludge is considered an organic material, the new CalRecycle SLCP regulation require reduced organic waste disposal in MSW landfills and would not allow co-disposal with MSW. The SLCP regulation does allow sludge/biosolids use as interim cover soil amendment. We will offer further comments under the 6/26/2020 Draft Comments.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The intent of Specification C.25 is to prevent groundwater impacts from liquids associated with high moisture wastewater treatment plant sludge/biosolids discharge. Sludge/biosolids from wastewater treatment plants contain a wide range of potential pollutants (e.g., pathogens, metals, nutrients, PFAS, pharmaceuticals) and require special handling or management practices to prevent impacts to water quality. Specification C.25 states that the discharger “may” discharge sludge/biosolids with greater than 50% moisture to the lined WMU. The term “may” primarily applies to permanent disposal but could also apply to high moisture sludge/biosolid processing/handling if potential discharges are not adequately managed. The proposed General Order also includes Specification C.5, which requires the discharger to ensure all stockpiled wastes and diverted materials are managed to prevent impacts to groundwater and surface waters. If dischargers propose processing or diverting wastes such as sludge/biosolids at a location other than a lined WMU, they will need to provide a proposed alternative that will be protective of water quality, such as a low permeable pad, lined drainages, covers for wet weather, and additional monitoring in accordance with an Executive Officer approved JTD.

**Paso Robles Comment 8** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Reporting 16. This submittal schedule for the Paso Robles Landfill's JTD by March 2021. The last RWQCB accepted JTD for Paso Robles Landfill was submitted 10/31/2017. As a result, submittal of JTD by March 2021 is only 3.5 years versus typical 5-year frequency. Is that the RWQCB's intent and then go back on a 5-year frequency?

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment B includes the list of landfills and ROWD/JTD due dates: for Paso Robles Landfill, the new due date is September 1, 2021. This due date

is almost 4 years from previous JTD submittal versus typical 5-year frequency. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 9** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment B – Additional Findings 47. This item may cover upcoming new regulations including “Short Lived Climate Pollutants (SLCP): Organic Waste Reductions (started by SB1383)” regulations to reduce methane emissions from landfills. Please advise, clarify.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment C. Finding 67. And 68. addresses the SLCP regulations. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 10** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C – E. Pollution Control Systems 1.C. Annual monitoring of LCRS in a manner that makes one year’s test comparable to previous and subsequent tests at Paso Robles Landfill have been a combination of: a. Inspection/observation of LCRS pipes/rock gallery from upgradient Modules when opened for liner/LCRS system Module extension. When such liner/LCRS Module extensions occur, observations are made for obstructions, bioclogging, biological growth, silt; b. Inspection/observations of gravity feed leachate tanks for biological growth, bioclogging, etc.; c. Inspection/observations of pumped leachate from leachate sumps for biological material, bioclogging potential; and when appropriate video inspection of piping can be conducted. We don’t recommend flushing the LCRS system with water or testing the LCRS system with a volume of injected water and compare to water coming out of the LCRS system. Such introduction of excess water into the LCRS system is not desired. Is the description of Paso Robles Landfill’s LCRS monitoring meet the intent of this requirement?

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A. E. Pollution Control Systems 1.c. has changed the prescriptive standard for annual testing to allowing the discharger to describe their proposed method of Annual testing/inspection. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 11** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C- Page C-5, F. Analytical Monitoring and Monitoring Locations. 1. Monitoring Periods b. Semiannually – lists 1st and 2nd semi-annual monitoring periods Jan 1 – June 30, and July 1 - Dec. 31, respectively. Paso Robles Landfill’s MRP has had their Semiannual Monitoring Period April 1 – Sept 30, and Oct. 1 – March 31 for many years. Is it the intent of the General WDR to change the semiannual periods for Paso Robles Landfill and all landfills to the listed semiannual periods?

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A has changed the Monitoring Periods to coincide with PRLF existing MRP Monitoring Periods. No further comments.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 12** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C – Table C-1 refers to Tables 2 (C-2?), Table 3 (C-3?) and Table 6 (?? No such Table), Could Table 6 have been intended to reference Table C-4 as this is Table for landfill gas (LFG) monitoring?

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A has corrected the Table numbers. No further comments.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 13** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C – Page C-5, Table C-1 Monitoring Points reference “Monitoring Well ID” at Semiannual Frequency but on Pg C-6 under b. Table C-1 Provisions iii. *Groundwater elevations shall be monitored quarterly as specified in Part I F.7 of this MRP.* Paso Robles Landfill’s groundwater wells water levels have been monitored on a semiannual frequency for years consistent with the site’s MRP.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A corrected the groundwater monitoring frequency to semiannually. No further comments.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 14** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C – Page C-6, C-7, Table C-2 Monitoring Parameters are listed for groundwater, stormwater, and leachate monitoring. Stormwater parameters in the Paso Robles Landfill’s MRP are significantly less than the Table C-2 list. Total Suspended Solids and Oil and Grease are included in the Paso Robles Landfill’s MRP, but not the Table C-2 list. Please confirm the intent of having one list for ALL water monitoring parameters versus separate parameter for Groundwater, Stormwater and Leachate.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A lists monitoring parameters/constituents the same for groundwater, leachate and stormwater. The stormwater monitoring parameters/constituents are significantly more than previous MRP’s and Industrial Stormwater Permit. As questioned in our 11/8/2019 comment, is it the intent of RWQCB to have exactly the same monitoring parameters for all three types of liquid sampling or will there be landfill specific MRP’s that would change the list of monitoring parameters? Please clarify and advise.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The proposed General Order MRP is intended to have consistent liquid monitoring parameters between groundwater, leachate, and stormwater in sediment retention basins. Stormwater within sediment retention basins and leachate within WMUs can impact groundwater. Similar monitoring requirements between liquid sampling locations facilitates source evaluation and identification for determining measurably significant evidence of release.

Existing stormwater monitoring parameters are limited in scope and may not properly identify constituents associated with landfill activities that could impact groundwater. In the last decade or so, landfills have transitioned from burying most materials that enter the landfill site, to diverting a large amount of the material to extend landfill life and for recycling purposes. Large volumes of materials are now processed onsite and can contribute to stormwater impacts including green waste processing, diverted metals stockpiling, wood waste processing, and household hazardous waste processing areas to name a few. The requirement is intended to ensure stockpiled and diverted materials processing, in addition to traditional landfilling activities, are managed to minimize impacts to groundwater and surface waters. Requiring one sample per year in stormwater retention basins will help ensure that runoff from areas associated with active landfill activities do not adversely impact groundwater. The proposed General Order only requires one sample per year from stormwater retention basins that can be scheduled during groundwater monitoring events to minimize cost and impacts to landfill resources.

Although the General MRP requires consistent monitoring parameters for liquid sampling locations, dischargers can recommend and justify changes during the development of a site specific MRP and enrollment in the General Order. The intent is to ensure that runoff associated with landfill activities will not negatively impact groundwater. Staff removed the stormwater discharge monitoring requirement and will rely on the Industrial Stormwater Permit to evaluate impacts to discharged stormwater, except for General MRP required conditional monitoring due to a leachate seep or waste spill discharge to stormwater.

**Paso Robles Comment 15** – Attachment C – Page C-9, 5. Stormwater Monitoring. b. *Annually, the Discharge shall sample stormwater within the (appropriate site-specific identified retention sedimentation basin) for the monitoring parameters included in Table C-2.* Under Paso Robles Landfill's previous MRP and Industrial Stormwater Permit, the *discharge* from the retention sedimentation basins were the only required/permitted sampling location. Thereby, when Paso Robles Landfill didn't have a stormwater discharge, no stormwater sampling and testing was conducted. Sampling in the pond versus the discharge can yield different parameter test results. Please consider.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A. Part I.F.5.b. requires annual stormwater sampling from "within" the sediment retention basin(s), not at discharge. This required sampling location is different than the Industrial Stormwater Permit which requires sampling of the discharge, not from 'within' the basin. Please clarify.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The intent of the sediment retention basin sampling is to evaluate whether pollutants are present in landfill runoff and to make sure that pollutants are not impacting groundwater through infiltration from stormwater in the retention basins. Staff revised the proposed General Order MRP Part I.F.5 and Table A-1 to remove the annual stormwater monitoring from offsite discharge sampling locations, dischargers will still have to sample these locations in accordance with the Stormwater Program Industrial General Permit (IGP). The annual stormwater monitoring of the sediment retention basins and conditional monitoring from either sediment retention basins or landfill discharge points is still included in the proposed General MRP. Most landfills retain stormwater onsite in sediment retention basins to reduce their discharge offsite and maximize sediment retention. Unlined stormwater retention basins discharge to groundwater; if pollutants are detected dischargers can evaluate facility operations to prevent impacts to groundwater.

**Paso Robles Comment 16** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C – Page C-10 6. Landfill Gas b. Table C-4 Provisions iii. *If gas probes or landfill collection header contains methane concentrations greater than 5%, the Discharger shall collect and analyze a gas sample for volatile organic compounds.* Perimeter landfill gas probes are significantly different than landfill gas headers. Perimeter landfill gas probes have less than 5% methane. A landfill gas collection system with wells, laterals and headers will have landfill gas with methane concentrations greater than 5%. Triennial Source Testing per SLO APCD permit includes VOC sample collection on inlet and outlet of the flare stack. Please clarify RWQCB intent and sample location(s).

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A. Part I. for Landfill Gas Monitoring is missing a heading and number. This new requirement to sample the landfill gas prior to the flare and run TO-15 VOC analysis will be conducted on an annual basis. When the LFG probes have <5% Methane, no TO-15 sampling and analysis is required. Please verify.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff revised the proposed General MRP to include the missing headings for the LFG Monitoring section. LFG probes with <5% methane do not require VOC sampling and analysis. A LFG header typically has >5% methane and would require VOC sampling and analysis annually. The intent of the requirement is to evaluate VOC concentrations in landfill gas to allow for comparison with potential VOC groundwater impacts. This requirement is included in recently adopted landfill individual WDRs and is included in the proposed General Order, in part, to provide consistent requirements for all landfills.

**Paso Robles Comment 17** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C – Page C-10 6. Landfill Gas b. Table C-4 Provisions iv. *The TO-15 laboratory method is required once annually per landfill gas monitoring point with methane greater than 5%. We assume the reference is to perimeter landfill gas probes.* Paso Robles Landfill's perimeter landfill gas monitoring probes have historically been the location for sampling of TO-15 for testing. However, these perimeter landfill gas monitoring probes contain

less than 5% methane and therefore do not require sampling and testing for TO-15. Please clarify RWQCB intent.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A clarifies this item, where if LFG probes have <5% Methane, no TO-15 sampling and analysis is required. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 18** – [In 10/30/19 preliminary draft] Attachment C – Page C-16 Monitoring Report. *The Discharger shall submit a Monitoring Report semiannually by January 31 and July 31 of each year.* These monitoring report semiannual submittal dates for the Paso Robles Landfill are different than current semiannually reporting by April 30 and October 30 of each year.

The 6/26/2020 Draft Attachment A Part IV. B. Monitoring Report addresses this comment in footnote 8. No further comment.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – As noted above, the comment on the preliminary draft was addressed in the draft General Order.

**Paso Robles Comment 19** – Sludge/Biosolids: Prohibition B. 2.c.vi. liquid or semi-solid waste, such as sludge, containing less than 50 percent solids by weight must comply with Specification C.25. Specification C.25 requires sludge with greater than 50 percent moisture to be placed in WMU with a composite base liner and LCRS along with meeting other MSW co-disposal limitations. No other sludge handling options are noted in this Draft WDR. Our concern with this limited description of sludge handling at active landfills include: 1. New SLCP regulations with reduction of organic waste at landfills will not allow co-disposal of sludge/biosolids with MSW; 2. New SLCP Regulations allow sludge/biosolids beneficial use as soil amendment for interim landfill cover; 3. Historic method of sludge/biosolids handling/processing at Paso Robles Landfill on unlined pads for drying, mixing with wood chips and soil to create a RWQCB and approved interim cover soil amendment in an environmentally sound manner.; 4. Future methods for drying, mixing with wood chips and soil to create a RWQCB approved final cover vegetation layer. We respectfully request under Specification C.25 RWQCB add new item “d. RWQCB will consider an acceptance mechanism for historic/existing and future methods of sludge/biosolids handling, processing on native, unlined permitted landfill area.”

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – If dischargers propose processing sludge/biosolids with greater than 50% moisture at a location other than over a lined WMU module, they will need to provide a proposed alternative that will prevent discharge and be protective of water quality, such as a low permeable pad, lined drainages, covers for wet weather, and additional monitoring in accordance with an Executive Officer approved JTD. See response to Paso Robles comment 7.

**Paso Robles Comment 20** – Stockpiled Waste, Recyclables Pollution Controls. Specification C. 5. New requirement for ensuring stockpiled wastes and diverted materials are managed to prevent creation of pollution and/or nuisances to stormwater, groundwater, and surface water quality. This requirement requires changes to the JTD with details of existing control methods, future control methods or new improvements to accomplish the requirement. There may be the need for additional site improvements for existing landfill stockpiles and future stockpiles resulting from new SLCP requirements (reduction of landfilled organic). Please advise if this is correct.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The requirement is intended to ensure stockpiled and diverted materials are handled in a way to minimize impacts to groundwater and surface waters. Although proposed General Order Specification C.5 is new, existing landfill individual WDRs and the Stormwater Program IGP require that dischargers prevent impacts to groundwater, surface water, and stormwater. Staff added Specification C.5 to clarify and emphasize that stockpiled materials and diverted materials must be managed to prevent impacts, because dischargers are being required to divert more and more waste for reuse and recycling. While Central Coast Water Board staff are supportive of diversion efforts, diverted wastes must be managed in a manner that prevents impacts to water quality and protects beneficial uses.

**Paso Robles Comment 21** – Drainage Ditch Low-Permeable Layer. Specification C.9. New Requirement for Drainage ditches crossing areas of previously disposed waste that have been inactive for over 1 year, a 1-foot layer of low-permeable soil on the drainage ditches is required. An engineered alternative to prevent erosion and percolation through waste may be presented for Executive Officer approval. Please advise if this is correct.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Specification C.9 allows for an Executive Officer approved alternative to prevent erosion and percolation through waste. See response to Paso Robles comment 4 above.

**Paso Robles Comment 22** – Reasonably Foreseeable Release (Water or Non-water Based). Reporting G.19. New Requirement for the discharger to prepare an updated report on reasonably foreseeable release (water and non-water based) along with adjusted financial assurance with the initial JTD and every 5 years thereafter for Executive Officer approval. The non-water based reasonably foreseeable release was originally required by CalRecycle and in general, most landfills found that the water reasonably foreseeable release had higher corrective action costs than Non-Water Reasonably Foreseeable Release. What is the necessity of updating the Non-Water Reasonably Foreseeable Release given the previous findings already documented for landfill facilities that the Water Reasonably Foreseeable Release has a higher cost?

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The proposed General Order Provision G.19 requires dischargers to demonstrate financial assurance compliance every five years or with submittal of the discharger's JTD. Demonstration of compliance is not necessarily new financial assurance estimates, as dischargers can submit the original

financial assurance estimates, verify the accuracy of previous estimates and any annual inflation adjustments, update previous estimates as necessary, and include documentation of financial instruments.

**Paso Robles Comment 23** – WDR Order No. R3-2020-0001 Site Specific Effective Date. Attachment C Findings 5. and 6. indicates that the ROWD/JTD must be submitted and approved by the Executive Officer for each landfill facility to obtain coverage under this General WDR Order No. R3-2020-0001 and a facility specific MRP be issued to supersede the current landfill facilities WDR and MRP. Please advise if this is correct.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Landfills are subject to their site specific individual WDRs until the Executive Officer issues a notice of applicability (NOA) for enrollment in the General Order which will include approval of the ROWD/JTD and a site specific MRP. Upon enrollment in the General Order, the facilities site specific individual WDR will be terminated.

### **City of Watsonville Landfill**

**Watsonville Comment 1** – The City of Watsonville (City), has reviewed the proposed General Waste Discharge Requirements Order R3-2020-0001, and with this letter the City is requesting that the Joint Technical Document (JTD) submittal date of March 1, 2021, as proposed for the City of Watsonville Landfill in the Order, be changed to March 1, 2023. The City is requesting this change based on the following information.

The City is in the process of preparing for the Closure of Phase III landfill. Based on the data from a recent survey that was performed on June 10, 2019, and using the average daily tonnage of refuse received at the landfill, December 31, 2020 was estimated as the date that the Phase III landfill would reach the final permitted elevation, and the start of the closure activities. However, due to changes in the volume of refuse received, the final elevation is now expected to be reached during the second week of September 2020, at which time or shortly thereafter the City intends to begin surcharging the Phase III landfill prior to the start of raining season in September/ October of 2020. The new date and City's plan for surcharging were discussed, during a project status update telephone conversation on July 14, 2020, with Alfred Worcester of Cal Recycle.

As you know, Cal Recycle has agreed with up to a 2-year period for surcharging to allow for refuse settlement prior to the construction of the final cap. However, the surcharging period might end sooner than two years, at which time the City would start the final cap construction and closure process for the Phase III landfill. This in turn would trigger the requirement for updating the JTD again as the status of landfill would change from Active to Closed. Also, per CalRecycle requirement, the City submitted their revised JTD in March 2018. The next revised document is due in March 2023. Therefore, considering the recent submittal of the JTD document, upcoming financial and labor demands for surcharging and closure activities for the closure of the Phase 111, and the unexpected effects of COVID-19 on City's operations, the City would like to

postpone the date of the JTD submittal to March 1, 2023, to focus our labor and financial resources on the closure of the Phase III landfill.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The City is not required to revise the JTD, especially if closure is imminent. The City can provide updates associated with any requirement that is not currently addressed in the JTD.

Proposed General Order Attachment B includes a submittal schedule for JTDs that is prioritized based on the age of the existing landfill WDRs and phases the submittals to allow for efficient Central Coast Water Board staff review, development of site specific MRPs, and enrollment in the proposed General Order. It is important to note that existing JTDs should be accurate to current operations through periodic revisions or amendments. The process of updating individual WDRs is less efficient than the enrollment in the proposed General Order for both dischargers and Central Coast Water Board staff. Staff acknowledge the convenience of submitting updated JTDs consistent with anticipated CalRecycle JTD submittal schedules, but most dischargers will be able to submit their most recent JTDs with a cover letter statement of accuracy and revisions or amendments to address recent changes and/or compliance with the proposed General Order.

Regarding Covid-19 concerns, it is the position of the State of California that protection of the public health and the environment are essential functions. By extension, compliance with Water Boards requirements (i.e. General Order) are also an essential function. The Central Coast Water Board recognize the challenges faced by the regulated community during this crisis and the need to adjust in response. If Dischargers submit a request for relief due to Covid-19 circumstances, Central Coast Water Board staff will evaluate the request and the Executive Officer will provide a response denying relief, temporarily suspending applicable requirements, or extending due dates. If dischargers are unable to comply with existing individual waste discharge requirements or the proposed General Order, Central Coast Water Board staff will evaluate the circumstances of noncompliance consistent with the State Water Board's Enforcement Policy, which allows for consideration of mitigating circumstances.

### **County of Santa Cruz – Buena Vista Landfill**

**Santa Cruz County Comment 1** – Our major concern regarding the WDR General Order are the additional stormwater monitoring requirements. Santa Cruz County respectfully requests that the stormwater requirements in the proposed WDR General Order be made equivalent to the Industrial General Permit (IGP Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ). The proposed weather-tracking, inspection, and monitoring requirements are more onerous than in the IGP. The County believes that active landfills should be regulated consistently throughout the State. At this time, the proposed stormwater requirements would place both a financial burden and a burden on County staff who must meet both the storm water requirements in the IGP and the additional stormwater requirements in the proposed WDR.

The County has two facilities regulated under the IGP, with a total of 11 stormwater discharge points to sample and only one staff person who must go to both sites during a Qualifying Rain Event (QRE). Additionally, the proposed WDR requires extensive weather-tracking and rainfall analysis in order to be able to meet the proposed site inspection requirements and to record the accumulated precipitation and return rating (25-yr, 100-year, etc.) of the most intense 24-hour rainfall event occurring each month, as well as the number and date of storms (greater than or equal to one inch in 24 hours) received each month. Logistically, adding the additional stormwater requirements of increased weather-tracking, inspections, sampling the more extensive list of parameters per the Draft WDR in Tables A-1 and A-2, and rainfall analysis, would make meeting both stormwater permit requirements nearly impossible. The same County staff that covers all the stormwater requirements for both facilities, must also cover all other environmental permits (Health & Safety, RCRA, SPCC, etc.).

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff removed the draft requirement to conduct surface water discharge monitoring but will include one sample event per year from stormwater retention basins. Current stormwater monitoring does not capture all potential pollutants associated with landfill activities. In the last decade or so, landfills have transitioned from burying most materials that enter the landfill site, to diverting a large amount of the material to extend landfill life and to meet recycling requirements. Large volumes of materials are now processed onsite and can contribute to stormwater impacts including green waste processing, diverted metals stockpiling, wood waste processing, and household hazardous waste processing areas to name a few. The requirement is intended to ensure stockpiled and diverted materials processing, in addition to traditional landfilling activities, is managed to minimize impacts to groundwater and surface waters. Central Coast Water Board staff determined that requiring one sample per year in stormwater retention basins is reasonable and will help ensure that runoff from areas associated with active landfill activities do not adversely impact groundwater.

Central Coast Water Board staff determined that the additional storm tracking requirements are necessary to accurately assess landfills ability to handle storm events. Landfill staff should track storms to understand the impacts of successive events on the landfill in addition to knowing the size and duration of storm events. Without the information, storm impacts on landfill facilities would be difficult to correct if the size and duration of storm events is not known. The additional storm tracking requirements will also allow Central Coast Water Board staff to evaluate the effects of climate change and potentially require improvements to stormwater handling proactively.

Proposed General Order MRP Part I.A.1. includes a footnote that clarifies the intent of the requirement for landfill staff to use professional judgment to determine how quickly an inspection is warranted. Central Coast Water Board staff recommend onsite personnel perform landfill facility inspections following wet weather. Inspections are critical, but the level of detail can be adjusted depending on previous storms, and most recent storm intensity and duration. Staff have revised the footnote within proposed

General Order MRP Part I.A.1 to include intent for professional judgment regarding inspection detail.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 2** – (WDR Prohibition B.5) Is there a legacy/grandfather provision for existing WMUs?

**Central Coast Water Board Response** – Prohibition B.5 prohibits the discharge of waste within 50 feet of the property line or 100 feet from a surface water body or domestic water supply wells. Existing waste is not covered by the prohibition. Planned modules must receive Executive Officer approval if waste will be placed in locations that can't comply with Prohibition B.5. New units should be planned to comply with the prohibition and if not, must receive Executive Officer approval prior to construction.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 3** – (WDR Specification C.4) Please clarify this requirement pertains to non-contact water and that contact water can be managed to percolate through the WMU into the LCRS?

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Proposed Specification C.4 requires that dischargers prevent surface drainage from offsite areas and onsite drainage of surface and subsurface origins from contacting or percolating through waste. Water (rain) that contacts waste can be allowed to percolate through waste. Active face operations should be managed to minimize contact water and any run-on should never contact waste. The intent of the specification is to prevent clean stormwater from contacting waste material. Central Coast Water Board staff recognize that some stormwater contact is unavoidable, and that contact water can be infiltrated into waste.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 4** – (WDR Specification C.9) Will CQA be required to demonstrate permeability requirement? Are there any demonstrations required for EO approved alternative?

**Central Coast Water Board Response** – Proposed General Order Specification C.9 requires that all drainage ditches that cross areas with previously disposed waste and that are inactive for one year be lined. The proposed General Order does not require CQA for drainage liners. See response to Paso Robles comment 4 above.

Regarding demonstrations for EO approved alternatives, Central Coast Water Board staff anticipate that the majority of discharger proposed alternatives for lined drainages will not require a demonstration, but new technology or an unusual application of existing technology as a drainage liner could require a demonstration prior to Executive Officer approval.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 5** – (WDR Specification C.13) This requirement is vague. Please clarify if this is intended to be similar to the existing CalRecycle requirements in 27 CCR 20695?

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The CalRecycle requirements based on CCR, title 27, §20695(a) require vector control as a cover performance standard. Central Coast Water Board staff anticipate that CalRecycle along with the local county environmental health agencies will continue to be the primary agencies regulating onsite public health issues related to vectors (e.g., flies, rats, rodents, mosquitos, wasps, cockroaches, seagulls). Proposed General Order Specification C.13 is more broad than the referenced CCR, title 27, CalRecycle requirement and requires the discharger to prevent the formation of habitat for carriers of pathogenic microorganisms throughout the landfill facility, except for beneficial wildlife habitat within stormwater and water supply basins. One example is uncontrolled bird activity at landfills that can result in elevated bacteria concentrations in local surface waters. Dischargers are required to implement measures to minimize bird activity to prevent potential impacts. Typically, Central Coast Water Board staff are most likely to identify potential habitat for carriers of pathogenic microorganisms during an inspection and would require the discharger to evaluate, and if necessary, implement corrective action to comply with the proposed General Order.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 6** – (WDR Closure Specification 3.a.i) Please clarify as this requirement can be interpreted to require 100% relative compaction, which is impractical to routinely obtain. Suggest specifying minimum 90 percent relative compaction.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The compaction language included in proposed General Order Closure Specification 3.a.i. is consistent with CCR, title 27, §21090, and allows for using methods in accordance to accepted civil engineering practice for compaction. Proper compaction is required to establish a firm unyielding foundation layer to install the final cover. Central Coast Water Board staff use best professional judgment when reviewing and approving final cover projects and did not specify a maximum relative compaction in the proposed General Order because it could limit methods and materials used for effective final cover construction.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 7** – (MRP Part I.A.1) This requirement is worded such that the discharger must conduct inspections EITHER every rain event producing runoff or a rain event producing 1-inch of rain within a 24-hr period. The current IGP visual observation requirements are monthly inspections, sample event inspections (producing run-off), and an annual evaluation. Post-storm inspection may already be performed, but this may not be within 24 hours. This requirement adds an additional workload burden to conduct the inspection, fill out inspection forms, etc.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff's intent with this requirement is that landfill staff conduct inspections after rain events that cause runoff. If the event does not cause runoff but is more than 1-inch within 24-hrs then an inspection is required. Central Coast Water Board staff have included this requirement in more recently updated MRPs. The requirement is in place to ensure that all drainage facilities are evaluated to verify they are functioning properly. Landfill staff should inspect drainage facilities to make sure they are clear of debris or windblown litter. Blocked

drainages can have significant impacts on landfill operations and stability and are critical to a proper functioning landfill and stormwater conveyance system.

Proposed General Order MRP Part I.A.1. includes a footnote that clarifies the intent of the requirement for landfill staff to use professional judgment to determine how quickly an inspection is warranted. A simple inspection checklist and a cursory check of critical landfill areas (e.g., drainages, slopes, covers, waste disposal areas, offsite discharge points) is likely sufficient for most storms. Early season low intensity storms would require the least detail, whereas high intensity storms or a relatively wet season would require inspections of greater detail. Inspections following wet weather are critical at landfill facilities. Prompt identification of a leachate seep can result in minor corrective actions. Failure to identify problems promptly is more likely to result in significant water quality impacts and expense to implement appropriate corrective actions. Staff have revised the footnote within proposed General Order MRP Part I.A.1 to allow for use of professional judgment regarding inspection detail.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 8** – (MRP Part I.C.2 & I.C.3) Recommend including the NOAA website link (like in the Industrial General Permit and the Construction General Permit), where the discharger can pull this rain event information.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Central Coast Water Board staff recognize that NOAA is a good resource for climate data and information. However, staff recommend not including a specific information resource to allow individual dischargers to provide site specific information from a source they recommend along with justification for that data source. For example, some dischargers prefer to utilize local flood control district information for their site climate data.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 9** – (MRP Part I.E.1.c) What documentation is required for annual LCRS testing? Please clarify requirements for determination of presence of biofouling? Is this a visual determination?

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff recognize the limitations and difficulties with annual testing of the LCRS pursuant to CCR, title 27, §20340(d), and that there are a variety of methods to comply with the requirement. The level of documentation will depend on the methods used to test the LCRS. Several consultants over the years have expressed reservations about adding liquid to an LCRS and measuring removal volumes to assess performance. An alternative might be to evaluate monthly leachate volumes and trends over several years, video recording leachate collection risers or lines to the sump and evaluating leachate sump pump performance. The presence or lack of biofouling might be a conclusion based on general leachate removal trends compared to design/expectations. The discharger can propose an LCRS testing alternative pursuant to CCR, title 27, §20380(e), which allows for an engineered alternative to prescriptive monitoring requirements.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 10** – (MRP Part I.F.3.a Table A.2) The list of parameters is more extensive than the currently sampling requirements under the IGP. Suggest making them consistent.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff revised the proposed General Order MRP Part I.F.5 and Table A-1 to remove the annual stormwater monitoring from offsite discharge sampling locations. The proposed General Order MRP is intended to have consistent liquid monitoring parameters between groundwater, leachate, and stormwater in sediment retention basins. See detailed response to Paso Robles comment 14.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 11** – (MRP Part I.F.5.c) Please clarify why sampling is required within sedimentation basins rather than the discharge from the basin when the sedimentation basin is intended to provide stormwater treatment. The list of parameters in Table A-2 are more extensive than what is required currently under the IGP. Suggest making them consistent.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The sediment retention basin sampling is required to evaluate whether pollutants are present in landfill runoff and to make sure that pollutants are not impacting groundwater through infiltration from stormwater retention basins. See response to Paso Robles comment 15.

**Santa Cruz County Comment 12** – (MRP Part I.F.5.c) The list of parameters in Table A-2 are more extensive than what is required currently under the IGP. Suggest making them consistent.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** –The proposed General Order MRP is intended to have consistent liquid monitoring parameters between groundwater, leachate, and stormwater in sediment retention basins. Staff revised the proposed General Order MRP Part I.F.5 and Table A-1 to remove the annual stormwater monitoring from offsite discharge sampling locations. See response to Paso Robles comment 14 and 15.

### **Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority (SVSWA) – Johnson Canyon Landfill**

**SVSWA Comment 1** – (WDR Prohibition B.5) No discharge of waste within 50 feet of property line, 100 feet of surface water, or 100 feet of domestic water supply wells. Clarification needed that existing and approved future waste management units are exempt from this provision.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The proposed prohibition allows for an Executive Officer approval for exceptions. See response to Santa Cruz comment 2.

**SVSWA Comment 2** – (WDR Specification C.8) discharger must construct a preferential leachate pathway layer on slope(s) where waste disposal will overlap previously disposed wastes in unlined area that are adjacent to lined WMUs with an

LCRS, except in locations where placement of a preferential pathway would produce an unstable slope or other potential impacts (i.e., leachate seeps). We are not in favor of this provision, specifically as it pertains to the future installation of landfill gas wells and potential impacts on landfill gas migration to groundwater and the vadose zone.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – While a preferential pathway might impact landfill gas collection from within the WMU, locating additional landfill gas extraction wells appropriately in the vicinity of the preferential pathway would likely mitigate concerns. Proposed General Order Specification C.8 includes enough flexibility for dischargers to propose a preferential pathway design that addresses potential impacts or if potential impacts are critical design issues, justification for no preferential pathway.

**SVSWA Comment 3** – (WDR Specification C.9) Discharger must line drainage swales crossing areas of previously disposed wastes that have been inactive for more than 1 year with a minimum of 1 foot of low permeability soil. This provision could result in substantial cost to the discharger and needs clarification. Is there a Construction Quality Assurance expectation to verify and report the material permeability and placement? Given that these drainage swales will be exposed to the elements and be prone to desiccation, what is the expectation for maintaining the low permeability component of the swales?

**Central Coast Water Board Response** – dischargers are required to maintain drainage facilities prior to and during the wet weather season in accordance to Provision F.5. Staff have revised General Order Provision F.5 to clarify drainage liner repair expectations. dischargers should evaluate engineered alternatives to low permeable soil drainage liners if maintenance is expected to be an issue as low permeable soils will likely require maintenance periodically to repair erosion, vegetation damage, or desiccation during the dry season for clay soils. The specification allows for an Executive Officer approved engineered alternative. If the SVSWA is concerned about desiccation or degraded materials, then it can submit plans to use other materials. The intent of the requirement is to minimize infiltration of stormwater into waste and to minimize erosion into waste. See response to Paso Robles comment 4.

**SVSWA Comment 4** – (WDR Provision F.6) Throughout the rainy season of each year the discharger must seed and maintain vegetation over all WMU slopes, excluding the active disposal area, to prevent erosion. Current WDR requirements have a similar provision however it requires this to be in place by October 1 of the year in preparation of the winter. SVSWA feels that the current requirement is sufficient and that attempting to place additional seed during the rainy season, especially on difficult to reach slopes, could result in further damage to slopes.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The intent of proposed Provision F.6 is that dischargers continue efforts to establish and maintain vegetation throughout the rainy season. All maintenance requirements included in the proposed General Order are predicated on site specific evaluations and determinations to ensure that

maintenance efforts do not damage landfill infrastructure or slopes. However, Central Coast Water Board staff often see landfills hydroseed slopes prior to the rainy season, but the effort does not result in established vegetation on slopes. Central Coast Water Board staff expect dischargers to establish vegetation during the rainy season and if opportunity presents itself to conduct maintenance during the rainy season, dischargers should take advantage of the opportunity. Staff have found that rain events often arrive early and then weather patterns can dry out for weeks or months at a time. If seed is applied prior to the rainy season, but does not result in vegetative growth, the discharger is expected to continue to efforts to establish vegetated slopes including reseeded or the application of organic material or soil amendments to promote vegetative growth.

**SVSWA Comment 5** – (MRP Part I.F.5.b) Requires annual stormwater monitoring within sediment retention basins for the Table A-2 parameters. We find this duplicative given that the stormwater on site is already covered under the Industrial General Permit and this would add a significant cost to the monitoring program.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Current stormwater monitoring does not capture all potential pollutants associated with landfill activities. The intent of the sediment retention basin sampling is to evaluate whether pollutants are present in landfill runoff and to make sure that pollutants are not impacting groundwater through infiltration from stormwater in the retention basins. See response to Paso Robles comments 14 and 15.

**SVSWA Comment 6** – (MRP Part I.F.6.a) Requires water levels to be monitored quarterly including the times of expected highest and lowest water level elevations unless the discharger provides sufficient site-specific justification for semiannual monitoring. Sufficient justification can be subjective and SVSWA is concerned of the increased cost associated with potentially increasing the frequency of field sampling crews being dispatched to perform just this function for what could be multiple times per year. We feel that the current bi-annual requirement is sufficient.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – CCR, title 27, §20415(e)(15) requires groundwater measurements and flow direction quarterly. CCR, title 27, §20380(e), allows for an Executive Officer approved engineered alternative to any prescriptive monitoring requirements. Therefore, dischargers can provide data, if available, to indicate that continued semiannual water level monitoring is sufficient to capture seasonal fluctuations in groundwater elevations. If a site has significant historical data indicating limited groundwater fluctuations, Central Coast Water Board staff would expect that semiannual monitoring would continue to satisfy the requirements. However, if semiannual data indicates significant fluctuations in groundwater elevations due to activities including neighboring property owners water usage and pumping or land use changes, then quarterly groundwater elevation monitoring will be required.

### **Camp Roberts Landfill**

**Camp Roberts Comment 1** – (WDR Prohibition B.4) Camp Roberts also operates our own wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), regulated by WDR Order Number 2014-0046. The WWTP’s WDR specifically authorizes discharges of our landfill’s leachate to the WWTP. The WWTP effluent discharges to adjacent percolation ponds. It should be noted that, as documented in all the annual reports since the South Unit’s construction, our landfill generates a very clean leachate.

The prohibition appears to contradict the WWTP WDR. If in the future Camp Roberts were to be prohibited from discharging leachate to the sewer plant it would impose a severe operational and financial strain on the installation.

Camp Roberts requests modification of Prohibition number 4 to append language similar to “unless authorized by the Executive Officer.”

**Central Coast Water Board Response** – Proposed General Order Prohibition B.4 prohibits the discharge of waste or leachate to waters of the state including groundwater. The discharge of leachate must be regulated through waste discharge requirements for discharges to land, or a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for discharges to surface water. Proposed General Order Prohibition B.4 does not prohibit discharges of landfill leachate to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). If future revisions to the Camp WWTP WDRs prohibit the discharge of leachate to the WWTP, then Camp Roberts would need to find an alternative disposal option for leachate. The Executive Officer is not authorized to allow the discharge of waste or leachate to ponded waters, stormwater conveyance systems or waters of the state. Those activities would need to be regulated through waste discharge requirements for discharges to land or an NPDES permit for discharges to surface waters.

### **City of Lompoc Landfill**

**Lompoc Comment 1** – No reference to or provision for the circumstance of COVID 19 has been made in the draft WDRs. At this time the full impact of COVID 19 on Landfill staffing, resources and operations is not close to being known.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff understand that recent circumstances, including COVID-19, are a challenge for local communities. However, the proposed General Order is focused on water quality protection requirements regardless of the current staffing, resource, or operation issues that may result from COVID-19. It is the position of the State of California that protection of the public health and the environment are essential functions. By extension, compliance with Water Boards requirements (i.e. General Order) are also an essential function. The Central Coast Water Board recognize the challenges faced by the regulated community during this crisis and the need to adjust in response. If Dischargers submit a request for relief due to Covid-19 circumstances, Central Coast Water Board staff will evaluate the request and the Executive Officer will provide a response denying relief, temporarily suspending applicable requirements, or extending due dates. If dischargers are unable

to comply with existing individual waste discharge requirements or the proposed General Order, Central Coast Water Board staff will evaluate the circumstances of noncompliance consistent with the State Water Board's Enforcement Policy, which allows for consideration of mitigating circumstances.

**Lompoc Comment 2** – (WDR Specification C.15) For any alternative daily cover [ADC] use during the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the discharger must obtain Executive Officer approval prior to use. This section should be revised to allow for the continued use of previously approved, and successfully used ADC, including that used by the City of Lompoc.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff will review ADC materials used and materials proposed for future use when reviewing JTDs during the General Order enrollment process. If ADC has been successfully used without impacts to water quality, Central Coast Water Board staff does not expect any changes to that use will be needed. However, staff will also continue to verify and evaluate ADC use during inspections to ensure materials are being used properly and are minimizing impacts to water quality.

**Lompoc Comment 3** – (WDR Provision F.6) There should be an exception to the strict requirement for year-round re-vegetation activity, as some areas may not be safely accessible during, and soon after, winter storms. Wording such as "as soon as practicable after storm events that caused erosion or vegetation damage, if it is safe to do so."

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The intent of proposed Provision F.6 is that dischargers continue efforts to establish and maintain vegetation throughout the rainy season. All maintenance requirements included in the proposed General Order are predicated on site specific evaluations and determinations to ensure that maintenance efforts do not damage landfill infrastructure or slopes. See response to SVSWA comment 4.

**Lompoc Comment 4** – (WDR Provision F.6) Executive Director approval of soil amendments for revegetation (\*not to exceed annual nutrient needs.)

The addition of a determination soil amendments cannot exceed annual nutrient needs, will limit and delay use of viable, already used, successful, non-fertilizer amendments such as compost, as there is likely no information on the annual nutrient needs of native vegetation.

This requirement would likely result in a need for costly longterm study to determine the nutrient needs of vegetation and the nutrient contribution of a one-time application of soil amendment to encourage plants to be able to establish. In Lompoc Landfill's situation, we have tried repeatedly to get seeding to take, with little success. However, the use of compost and natural seeding has resulted in the establishment of vegetative cover in our pilot revegetation study.

Recommendation - exempt non-chemical, non-fertilizer amendments such as compost from this requirement for determination of nutrient needs and contribution.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff’s intent with this requirement is that dischargers evaluate expected nutrient loading associated with organic material used. Dischargers should determine the expected nutrients needs to establish and maintain good vegetative cover material. It is important that dischargers evaluate and understand the basic nutrient needs of vegetation necessary to successfully establish slope vegetation. The intent of the requirement is to ensure that organic materials are not overapplied on landfill slopes resulting in surface and/or groundwater impacts.

**Lompoc Comment 5** – (WDR Provision F.16) Requirement for regular 3rd Party reporting on Final Cover Construction directly to the Executive Officer will result in excessive costs, and difficulty, having an additional engineer onsite throughout closure activity.

Requiring as-built certification by the design engineer of record for the project would provide the same verification, as the design engineer would be putting his/her license on the line. Additionally, not providing copies of the reports to the Landfill operator and Design Engineer would preclude those individuals from verifying the accuracy of the reports and raising concerns regarding reporting inaccuracies, should they occur.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Independent third-party CQA implementation and reporting is standard for Central Coast Water Board approved WMU liner and final cover landfill projects. This proposed requirement is in existing landfill individual WDRs including the City of Lompoc’s and is intended to provide independent third-party oversight to ensure that proper testing and installation practices are followed for all WMU liner and final cover construction projects. Central Coast Water Board staff find that a licensed third party CQA engineer provides unbiased oversight on projects partly because they are not involved in project design planning and decisions. Alternatively, design engineers involved in project development may feel pressure from project owners to complete projects in a timely manner and below their original cost estimates. WMU liners and final covers are critical to the long-term containment of waste within a WMU. Dischargers typically have one opportunity to construct a WMU liner or final cover to contain waste and prevent impacts to water quality for the long-term. The proposed requirement for independent third party CQA oversight is based on good engineering practices and procedures to determine whether construction meets project design specifications or not.

**Lompoc Comment 6** – (WDR Reporting G.15) The language of this section should be modified as follows: The discharger must notify the Executive Officer, within 24 hours by telephone or email and submit a report of noncompliance within 14 days of having knowledge or discovery of: subsections a-e.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – All noncompliance reporting requirements are based on when the discharger has knowledge of noncompliance. Central Coast Water Board staff's expectation is that dischargers identify noncompliance issues and report them to Central Coast Water Board staff in a timely manner.

**Lompoc Comment 7** – (WDR Attachment C, Finding 5 and Reporting G. 18-20) Any requirements to revise critical landfill documents such as the JTD or closure / post-closure plan for a Landfill should be coordinated with the timing cycle requirements of CalRecycle.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – JTDs and closure plans should be up to date and contain accurate documents that reflect site conditions. Revisions to the JTD required by the proposed General Order can be submitted as addendums to the JTD rather than complete document revisions. The proposed General Order does not re-set document submittal schedules for JTD or closure plan requirements subject to review by CalRecycle. See response to Watsonville Comment 1.

**Lompoc Comment 8** – (WDR Closure Specification D.3.a.iv) Where the draft WDR requires "At least one foot of soil capable of supporting vegetation and resisting erosion" we request revised wording stating: "Enough soil capable of supporting vegetation and resisting erosion." This would be added to additional soil which may be lesser quality, to total a combined soil cap of at least one foot.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Proposed General Order Closure Specification D.3.b allows for an engineered alternative design for final covers. If a discharger proposes the use of materials that do not meet the final cover prescriptive standards found in CCR, title 27, §21090, they can submit a design proposal as an engineered alternative for review approval by the Executive Officer.

**Lompoc Comment 9** – (MRP Part I.F.1) The sampling period for the 5-year required sampling is not identified.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The 5-year constituents of concerns sampling should be submitted with the annual report following the sample year. All sites have varying schedules for the 5-year sampling and should continue with that schedule. The site specific MRP may include a more specific sampling period for 5-year constituents of concern monitoring based on the landfill facilities previous monitoring history.

**Lompoc Comment 10** – (MRP Table A-1) How is storm water and/or surface water differentiated from a retention basin of storm water. Sampling should only be required at the point of discharge, not in a holding basin on-site. Requiring both is 1) not representative of what is being discharged, and 2) is unnecessary duplication of effort.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** –Staff revised the proposed General Order MRP Part I.F.5 and Table A-1 to remove the annual stormwater monitoring from offsite discharge sampling locations Dischargers will still have to sample these locations in accordance with the Stormwater Program IGP. Retention basin monitoring is necessary to evaluate potential impacts to groundwater from landfill activities. See response to Paso Robles comments 14 and 15.

**Lompoc Comment 11** – (MRP Table A-2) The storm water sampling constituents found in Table A-2, are not likely to be found in storm water at every landfill. What is the basis for requiring these additional constituents be sampled, over and above the Landfill' IGP sampling requirements?

As sampling is costly and qualified laboratories can be hard to locate within required transport time, as well as the sampling found in Table A-2 will require additional equipment and calibration there should be a provision for removal of the requirement to sample for constituents that have been found not to be present for 2 years running.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The intent of the sampling is to evaluate constituents consistent with those sampled in groundwater and leachate. Similar monitoring requirements between liquid sampling locations facilitates source evaluation, groundwater typing, and determining measurably significant evidence of release. Existing stormwater monitoring parameters are limited in scope and may not properly identify constituents associated with landfill activities that could impact groundwater. Staff determined that current stormwater monitoring does not capture all potential pollutants associated with landfill activities. In the last decade or so, landfills have transitioned from burying most materials that enter the landfill site, to diverting a large amount of the material to extend landfill life and for recycling purposes. Large volumes of materials are now processed onsite and can contribute to stormwater impacts including green waste processing, diverted metals stockpiling, wood waste processing, and household hazardous waste processing areas to name a few. The requirement is intended to ensure stockpiled and diverted materials processing, in addition to traditional landfilling activities, are managed to minimize impacts to groundwater and surface waters. Requiring one sample per year in stormwater retention basins is reasonable and will help ensure that runoff from areas associated with active landfill activities do not adversely impact groundwater. The proposed General Order only requires one sample per year that can be scheduled during groundwater monitoring events to minimize cost and impacts to landfill resources. See response to Paso Robles Comments 14 and 15.

**Lompoc Comment 12** – (MRP Table A-2 Provisions) "approved Sampling and Analysis Plan in accordance to Part II A of this MRP." The word "to" should be replaced with the word "with" as in accordance with.

**Central Coast Water Board Response** – Staff agree with the comment and revised the provision accordingly.

**Lompoc Comment 13** – (MRP Table A-2 Provisions) Some of the storm water constituents found in Table A-2 are already sampled for based on IGP requirements. Duplication of sampling requirements should be reduced, allowing for IGP storm water sampling data to be utilized instead of requiring additional separate sampling for duplicate constituents.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The proposed General Order does not require duplicative sampling. If constituents are sampled under the Stormwater Program IGP, that data can be submitted to satisfy the stormwater retention basin analysis requirements as well.

**Lompoc Comment 14** – (MRP Table A-2 Provisions) No provision for consideration of background contributions of native soils and vegetation to Table A-2 constituents in storm water has been identified in the draft WDRs and should be included.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Background contributions in surface water should be considered by the individual dischargers. Proposed General Order Specification C.4 requires the discharger to prevent surface drainage from offsite areas from contacting or percolating through waste. The discharger has the option to isolate run-on flows and route them around the landfill to avoid background conditions impacting surface discharge sampling results. The discharger can collect upstream surface water samples to document background surface water quality conditions to compare with stormwater discharge water quality.

**Lompoc Comment 15** – (MRP Part I.F.5.d) Revise wording of this section to read: "Sediment sampling is not required if the discharger removes each basins' accumulated sediments prior to October 1 of each year and discharges the sediments into a WMU. As this is sediment only there should be no need for a requirement to place it in a lined WMU as subject landfills may be unlined and have no available lined WMU.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – If lined WMUs are not available for sediment disposal, then the discharger must ensure that it is appropriate to dispose of the sediment in an unlined WMU by conducting sediment sampling and analysis.

**Lompoc Comment 16** – (Attachment C, Finding 69) While many different sources or opinions can be used to identify the 100-year, 24-hour storm event for any particular landfill, the most appropriate local measure for the 100-year, 24-hour storm event is that used by the relevant County Flood Control Districts.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The proposed General Order does not require climate data from a particular source. Dischargers should use data that is accurate, relevant to the facility, and is obtained from reputable sources.

### **City of Santa Maria Regional Landfill and Los Flores Landfill**

**Santa Maria Comment 1** – (WDR Specification C.14.d) We have had rain events that result in very little measurable precipitation (<0.05 inches). Will the EO consider alternative hold periods based on amount of rainfall?

I.e.: No discharge within 24 hours after < 0.10 inches of rain in the previous 24-hours, or 48 hours after >0.10 inches of rain in the previous 24-hours.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Proposed General Order Specification C.14. indicates that condensate or leachate can be conditionally used on lined WMUs if it is not discharged to the surface of the WMU within 48 hours of any forecasted rain event, during any rain event, or 48-hours after any rain event. Staff recognize that some rain events can be small and may not significantly impact landfill operations. However, the timing of rain events is as important as the amount of rainfall. Small rain events can be preceded by several days or weeks of wet weather that may require the discharger to provide additional time for the site to dry out prior to discharging condensate or leachate. Sites vary in soil types, topography, and weather patterns that can limit the ability of WMUs to accept liquids. Central Coast Water Board staff find that 48 hours is a reasonable minimum timeframe to wait after rain events to discharge liquids to WMUs.

**Santa Maria Comment 2** – (WDR Specification C.15) The Executive Officer must approve "Any" ADC used during the wet season? CalRecycle has approved 11 types of ADC that do not require demonstration. The Water Board should consider an approved list of wet weather ADC, (i.e.: Geosynthetic fabric or panel products (blankets)).

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff will review and approve ADC as part of the enrollment process. Central Coast Water Board staff does not expect to reject commonly and currently used ADC but finds it necessary to review wet weather applications of ADC on a routine basis. Enrollment in the proposed General Order is an opportunity to review ADC use.

**Santa Maria Comment 3** – (WDR WQ Protection Standard E.3) This will need to be looked at closely. Several monitoring parameters may not provide the data objectives of detection monitoring because of site specific groundwater conditions.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Consistent with current practice, each landfill will have an MRP that is specific to the landfill. Staff do not anticipate significant changes from currently implemented MRPs with the exception of stormwater retention basin monitoring, general mineral sampling and piper and stiff diagram evaluations. Staff expects to offset the general mineral sampling and piper stiff diagram evaluations with a reduction in statistical data analysis for certain constituents. The site specific MRPs will identify indicator and supplemental monitoring parameters and require statistics pursuant to CCR, title 27, for indicator monitoring parameters.

**Santa Maria Comment 4** – (WDR WQ Protection Standard E.5) Implies that naturally occurring inorganic chemicals can exceed limits. The Water Board should clarify this point before the WDR goes into effect.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The Water Quality Protection Standard referenced indicates that the discharge of waste must not cause either a statistically significant difference in water quality or the concentrations of constituents to exceed water quality objectives. If the discharger has not caused naturally occurring inorganic constituents to exceed concentration limits or water quality objectives, then the discharger is not responsible for naturally occurring exceedances. Naturally occurring inorganic constituents are used in establishing concentration limits and should be included in the statistical analysis used to establish those limits.

**Santa Maria Comment 5** – (WDR Provision F.4) A site-specific monitoring program with tailored constituents is important because Santa Maria may have groundwater conditions that are unique and applying a blanket list of routine parameters could result in measurably significant false-positive concentrations that could trigger unnecessary site assessments to comply with Title 27.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The MRP included in the proposed General Order is an example of the MRP expected to be issued to dischargers. Each site has unique issues, geology, and hydrogeology that will dictate the constituents that will be monitored. Staff do not anticipate significant changes from currently implemented MRPs with the exception of stormwater retention basin monitoring, general mineral sampling and piper and stiff diagram evaluations.

**Santa Maria Comment 6** – (WDR Provision F.19) Per 27 CCR§ 22222, "At Units for which the CIWMB (CalRecycle) does not require financial assurances for corrective action, the RWQCB shall require the discharger to establish an irrevocable fund (or to provide other means) pursuant to the CIWMB-promulgated sections of this chapter but with the RWQCB named as beneficiary." Text should be added to the Order to exclude sites from naming the RWQCB as beneficiary if they already provide financial assurances for corrective action to CalRecycle.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Pursuant to CCR, title 27, staff revised proposed General Order Provision F.19 to only require the Central Coast Water Board be named as beneficiary if CalRecycle does not require corrective action financial assurance.

**Santa Maria Comment 7** – (MRP Part A.4) What is the "return rating"? (online searches yield "return period" with regards to rainfall) Is there to be a definition, calculation, region specific chart, guidance, etc.? What if there is no historical "site" data (i.e.: new landfill (Los Flores) which is likely to have its own microclimate, might be lacking historical data)?

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff revised the proposed General MRP Part I.A.4 to refer to "return period" instead of "return rating". For landfill facilities with little to no historical data, WMU design engineers will likely identify and justify the use of another nearby weather station/source for design purposes. Until more

appropriate local data is available, dischargers should use a weather data source that was used for design of the WMUs and facility drainage features.

**Santa Maria Comment 8** – (MRP Part I.D.1) The necessity of a daily running total of "tons remaining" and "remaining site life expectancy" is unclear, especially for sites with many years left. Remaining tons and site life is calculated based on airspace, compaction rates and inbound rates, all of which can vary from day to day. It is not feasible to obtain elevations and compaction rates and perform site life calculations and remaining tonnage capacity on a daily basis, therefore daily estimates will be inaccurate. Annual site life calculations which are performed as a component of financial assurance, are more realistic and practical.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff agree that remaining life expectancy calculations should be calculated on an annual basis and have revised the proposed MRP to indicate that remaining site life calculations should be conducted annually. Staff also revised the requirement allowing dischargers to estimate the amount for tons remaining for waste placement. Dischargers track tons of material disposed on a daily basis and should have an understanding of the estimated capacity remaining in tons. The information can be important in determining drainage patterns and runoff issues associated with the active face moving and site operations should have an understanding of the rate at which that is occurring.

**Santa Maria Comment 9** – (MRP Part I.D.5) The purpose of requesting "address, and phone number" from customers is unclear. What will be done with the information that is gathered? There is a concern that requesting this information may expose employees to confrontational and hostile situations. For refused loads, customers are directed to the onsite Household Hazardous Waste Facility (HHWF) or staff as appropriate. Currently for load checks, license plate numbers are recorded and names are requested. It is suspected that some of names provided are false. The Santa Maria HHWF collects names and addresses, which are at times refused or suspected to be false. Identity verification is beyond the scope of landfill staff. Additionally, there is a concern that denial of service for refusal to provide information will result in an increase in illegal dumping.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – This requirement is included in more recently updated MRPs. If a citizen is denied service due to materials that should not be disposed of at the landfill, it would be pertinent to attempt to obtain information from the citizen prior to sending them away. One of the reasons for obtaining information is to ensure that if the person leaves and dumps the material illegally, the City will have a better opportunity to identify illegal dumpers. The requirement to ask for information is for refused loads only. Dischargers must refuse loads of materials that are prohibited and may encounter dissatisfied customers simply because they are refusing the customers load. However, dischargers should still attempt to identify customers with rejected loads just as they are required to reject loads. Dischargers do not have control over the accuracy of the information provided, but an attempt to retrieve the information should be made. Staff revised the referenced section to require collection of the party's

personal contact information such as name, address, phone number, and/or license plate number.

**Santa Maria Comment 10** – (MRP Part I.D.6) All loads that require special handling/characterization at Santa Maria must be preapproved prior to arrival/landfilling. A log is maintained for each type of waste that requires special handling/characterization, however it does not contain characterization and testing results. All characterization and testing results are maintained but can be very extensive and including this info in a log is impractical and serves no purpose. Additionally, Santa Maria has site specific locations for certain types of waste (i.e.: asbestos, Non-hazardous Hydrocarbon Impacted Soils-NHIS), however, it is impractical and unnecessary to maintain this information in the log since a designated disposal area is already required per regulation and/or in the JTD. Providing specific detail such as exact latitude, longitude, and elevation for "each" load is not feasible and serves no purpose (especially due to the very small size of some loads and the potential for settling).

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The log documentation can reference the location of information if it is not in the log itself, as long as the discharger maintains the information. The documentation may simply be a reference to where the information is housed or managed. The discharger should provide the location of the special handling areas and where special loads are disposed. Latitude, longitude, and elevation are provided as examples of the information, but it is not required information. Dischargers can provide a description of the special waste disposal area or a figure indicating where materials were placed.

**Santa Maria Comment 11** – (MRP Part A.6) "Scheduled and unscheduled maintenance" is a broad description. There is extensive reporting to the Air Pollution Control District with regards to defined activities. To lessen the amount of duplicate reporting, the Water Board should reference these reports. Reports containing landfill gas collection system information can be provided to the Water Board. Additionally, the Water Board should consider the reporting schedules of other jurisdictions when requesting duplicate data/information.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** –Scheduled and unscheduled maintenance is intended to be broad and to capture system maintenance activities that could impact groundwater and surface water. If the City has the information related to Air Pollution Control District reporting requirements, and that information is pertinent to maintenance activities, then the City can provide that to the Water Board.

**Santa Maria Comment 12** – (MRP Table A-2) This list is a general starting point and not a site-specific list. Holding times should be considered by the Water Board before they include Nitrate. Major ions may not provide indications of a new release, which is the goal of detection monitoring. The significant water level changes that occur at Santa Maria are known to affect water quality independent of landfill activities. Many of the parameters on this list are useful for evaluations and typing groundwater quality but they may not provide indications of landfill releases.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The proposed MRP is an example MRP that will be tailored for specific landfills based on historic monitoring and site-specific considerations. Staff determined that general minerals can provide an indication of potential groundwater impacts from landfill activities. General minerals analysis is priority for the Central Coast Water Board and has been included in other discharge requirements in the region. If the analysis provides limited value to a particular facility due to site specific conditions, Central Coast Water Board staff will consider removing the requirement from the site specific MRP.

**Santa Maria Comment 13** – (MRP Table A-2, Nitrate (as Nitrogen)) This should be "Nitrate plus Nitrite as Nitrogen". There is a very short hold time for Nitrate as nitrogen and that is problematic and adds costs to the sample collection program.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Numerous discharge activities regulated by the Central Coast Water Board require nitrate (as nitrogen) analysis including the Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Composting Operations Order WQ 2015-0121-DWQ and the Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Winery Waste Central Coast Region Order No. R3-2017-0020. Nitrate (as nitrogen) is a common analyte and for consistency with other programs and data, the proposed General MRP will retain the analysis.

**Santa Maria Comment 14** – (MRP Table A-3 Provisions) All SVOCs is open ended. Labs can add or subtract analytes based on their calibration blanks. The Water Board should tighten up the language to include Subtitle D compounds rather than "all".

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff agree with the comment and removed the word "all" from the proposed provision. Table A-3 Provision b.i. indicates that the constituents of concerns include all constituents listed in Appendix II to Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), title 40, part 258, which are the Subtitle D compounds. Table A-3 Provision b.v. also states that SVOC constituents include unidentified peaks in accordance to Part II.A.6.

**Santa Maria Comment 15** – (MRP) Is this in addition to NPDES stormwater monitoring? This requirement could result in duplicate reporting to the Water Board? Programmatic changes that are not concurrent between this Order and the NPDES could overly complicated, with no added benefit to water quality. The Water Board should consider language and requirements that are in addition to but do not overlap NPDES requirements.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff revised the proposed General Order MRP Part I.F.5 and Table A-1 to remove the annual stormwater monitoring from offsite discharge sampling locations. Dischargers will still have to sample these locations in accordance with the Stormwater Program IGP. Retention basin monitoring is necessary to evaluate potential impacts to groundwater from landfill activities. See response to Paso Robles Comments 14 and 15 and Santa Cruz County Comment 11.

**Santa Maria Comment 16** – (MRP Table A-3 Provisions) "All VOCs" is a bit open ended. This list should be inclusive of Subtitle D Appendix 2.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff agree and have removed the word "all" from the proposed provision, similar to the response to Santa Maria comment 14.

**Santa Maria Comment 17** – (MRP) This requirement is an assessment of general water quality typing and may not provide any concrete indication of a release because of known water quality changes that occur as a result of water level changes.

**Central Coast Water Board Response** – The proposed requirement is to conduct graphical analysis using cation/anion data and Piper and Stiff diagrams for water quality source water identification purposes. The inclusion of the analysis aids in the determination of source water changes associated with water level variations. Central Coast Water Board staff will consider site specific historical data when developing MRPs and may limit some traditional statistical analysis in place of cation/anion evaluation. General minerals analysis is a priority for the Central Coast Water Board and has been included in other discharge requirements in the region. If the analysis provides limited value to a particular facility due to site specific conditions, staff will consider removing the requirement from the site specific MRP.

**Santa Maria Comment 18** – (MRP Part IV.B) It should be noted that 1 month is a relatively short amount of time for a thorough analysis and report generation for such a large amount of data and includes data such as landfill gas generation information that is concurrently reported to other agencies in reports due on March 1 and September 1 .

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – January 31<sup>st</sup> and July 31<sup>st</sup> are standard reporting deadlines for annual and semiannual reporting. The proposed General Order does not dictate when quarterly or semiannual monitoring takes place other than in the appropriate quarter or half year. Dischargers should plan sample collection activities with the reporting deadlines in mind. When staff draft a site specific MRP during the enrollment process, dischargers will have the opportunity to request alternate due dates for monitoring reports to provide extra time to address site complexity.

**Santa Maria Comment 19** – (MRP Part IV.C) The Water Board is asking for data they already have in GeoTracker. If sites do not have their data in GeoTracker, then the Water Board should require them to do so.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Simply submitting data and submitting a report indicating the discharger has reviewed the data and has identified issues or trends are different activities. Annual reporting is intended to ensure dischargers are not only submitting data but that they are also evaluating the data and trends to determine if discharge from the landfill are impacting water quality. Data submittal alone does not achieve that. It is the responsibility of the discharger to identify issues

and bring them to the attention of Central Coast Water Board staff and to propose corrective actions.

**RMC, Lawrence & Associates, Golder, Waste Connections – John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Landfills**

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 1** – (WDR Specification C.7) Suggest removing the sentence “and insulate the liner system from diurnal thermal effects” from the Specification as there is no feasible way to insulate a liner on a side slope.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Proposed General Order Specification C.7 requires the discharger to protect exposed WMU liners from ultraviolet light, wind exposure, and physical damage, and insulate the liner system from diurnal thermal effects until operations layer or protective cover soils have been placed. Insulating the liner system from diurnal thermal effects is an effort to reduce potential damage to the underlying GCL on slope liner or desiccation of the clay on the base liner and prevent water from collecting under the geomembrane at the bottom of slopes due to moisture evaporation from the slope GCL. Central Coast Water Board staff have approved several discharger proposals to protect exposed geomembrane from the damage discussed above including gray colored scrim sacrificial geomembrane cover over a geonet drainage layer resulting in lower surface temperatures and some insulation of the underlying geomembrane. Alternatively, sand may be applied several inches thick to act as insulation, with a scrim sacrificial geomembrane cover to reduce erosion or sliding of the sand due to wet weather.

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 2** – (WDR Specification C.21) Because of the variability of season, weather, waste acceptance rates it is not feasible to predict what area will not receive waste for a year, prepare a plan, obtain approval, retain a contractor, and implement the plan (within a construction season) for long-term cover within the time stated. We suggest a two-year time period to provide adequate time for implementation.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff agree with the comment and revised proposed General Order Specification C.21 to require an Executive Officer approved long-term intermediate cover for areas of the WMU, which will remain inactive for more than 2 years.

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 3** – (WDR Provision F.19) The second sentence states: Pursuant to CCR Title 27 §20380(b) and §22222, the discharger must obtain and maintain assurances of financial responsibility, naming the Central Coast Water Board as beneficiary, for initiating and completing corrective action for all known or reasonably foreseeable releases. It is likely that both Cal Recycle and the Central Water Quality Control board will need to be listed as beneficiaries.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Pursuant to CCR, title 27, staff revised proposed General Order Provision F.19 to only require the Central Coast Water Board

be named as beneficiary if CalRecycle does not require corrective action financial assurance.

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 4** – (WDR WQ Protection Standard E.4, E.5) We interpret these sections to mean that naturally-occurring inorganic constituents can exceed concentration limits. It would help to clarify this point as it affects most landfill facilities at one time or another.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The Water Quality Protection Standards referenced indicate that the discharge of waste must not cause either a statistically significant difference in water quality or the concentrations of constituents to exceed water quality objectives. If the discharger has not caused naturally occurring inorganic constituents to exceed concentration limits or water quality objectives, then the discharger is not responsible for naturally occurring exceedances. Naturally occurring inorganic constituents are used in establishing concentration limits and should be included in the statistical analysis used to establish those limits.

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 5** – (MRP Part E.1.c) The third sentence states: *The discharger must specifically address the absence or presence of biofouling in the Annual Summary Report.* There is no feasible way to assess biofouling within an LCRS because all of the elements that would be fouled are covered with waste and are not accessible for inspection. Except limited portions of the LCRS piping and LCRS sump. This evaluation should only be performed if there is a specific reason to do so.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – Staff recognize the limitations and difficulties with annual testing of the LCRS pursuant to CCR, title 27, §20340(d), and that there are a variety of methods to comply with the requirement. The level of documentation will depend on the methods used to test the LCRS. Several consultants over the years have expressed reservations about adding liquid to an LCRS and measuring removal volumes to assess performance. Alternative methods include evaluating monthly leachate volumes and trends over several years, video recording leachate collection risers or lines to the sump and evaluating leachate sump pump performance. The presence or lack of biofouling might be a conclusion based on general leachate removal trends compared to design/expectations.

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 6** – (MRP Part B.5.b) If no discharge from a pond occurs why would sampling be required for stormwater. Shouldn't sampling be at the point of discharge identified as part of the General Industrial Stormwater Permit? If the basin doesn't discharge due to sufficient capacity, does an annual sample still need to occur?

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – See response to Paso Robles Comment 15.

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 7** – (MRP Part B.5.b) If the basin happens to be full after the rain season and used as a water source but is not emptied before the start of the next rain season, does a sediment sample need to be taken, especially if it is determined there is sufficient capacity in the basin for the rainy season?

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – The intent of the sediment sampling is to characterize sediments left in sediment basins to determine if the materials should be removed prior to the next rainy season. Staff has determined that, if sediment is left in place, flows into and out of the sediment basin in subsequent years could result in mobilization and discharge of contaminated sediment materials. Sediment should be analyzed if it is left in the basin regardless of whether the basin is empty or not.

**John Smith Road and Cold Canyon Comment 8** – (MRP Part B.5.iii) Suggest rewording the portion in *red (underline italics)*:

*Landfill gas VOC sample collection is conditional, if perimeter-gas monitoring probes or landfill collection header contain methane concentrations greater than 5%, the discharger must collect and analyze landfill gas for VOCs. Landfill gas VOC monitoring is required once annually per landfill gas monitoring probe point with methane greater than 5%.*

The landfill collection header should always have methane greater than 5%. If the goal is to sample the LFG main to determine the VOC concentration in the pure LFG, state that if a perimeter gas monitoring probe is required to be sampled for VOC's, a sample shall also be collected from the main near vacuum blower to obtain background VOC's for comparison.

**Central Coast Water Board Staff Response** – LFG probes with <5% methane do not require VOC sampling and analysis. An LFG header typically has >5% methane and would require VOC sampling and analysis annually. The intent of the proposed requirement is to evaluate VOC concentrations in landfill gas to allow for comparison with potential VOC groundwater impacts. This proposed requirement is included in recently adopted landfill individual WDRs and is included in the proposed General Order, in part, to provide consistent requirements for all landfills.