

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL COAST REGION**

STAFF REPORT FOR REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 29, 2000

Prepared on November 1, 2000

ITEM: 10

SUBJECT: Executive Officer's Report to the Board

Brief discussion of some items of interest to the Board follow. Upon request, staff can provide more detailed information about any particular item.

Watershed and Cleanup Branch Reports

**REGULATION SUMMARY OF
SEPTEMBER 2000**

[Corinne Huckaby 805/549-3504
and Maura Mahon 805/542-4642]

Orders

| | |
|--|----|
| Reports of Waste Discharge Received | 5 |
| Requirements Pending | 47 |
| Inspections Made | 24 |
| *Self-Monitoring Reports Reviewed (WB) | 73 |
| *Self-Monitoring Reports Reviewed (CB) | 51 |
| Stormwater Reports Reviewed | 5 |
| *Tanks calculated based on 1999 data | |

Enforcement

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Non-Compliance Letters Sent: | |
| NPDES Program | 2 |
| Non-Chapter 15 WDR Program | 3 |
| Chapter 15 Program | 0 |
| Unregulated | 0 |
| CAOs Issued | 1 |
| ACL Complaints | 1 |
| Notice to Comply (NTC) | 0 |
| Storm Water (NOV) | 5 |
| Unregulated (FTS's – Tanks) | 2 |

WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATIONS

[Corinne Huckaby 805/549-3504]

Conditional Certification is appropriate when a project may adversely impact surface water quality. Conditions allow the project to proceed

under an Army Corps permit, while upholding water quality standards.

The Office of Administrative Law (OAL) has given approval of the "rule making record" and proposed regulations to govern Water Quality Certification. The new regulations effect the following changes:

1. Delegate day to day certification action to the Regional Boards (EO). Multi-Region issues and water rights issues are still handled by State Board.
2. Implement a new fee structure. The new fees are: \$500 for standard certification and \$1000 per acre (up to 10 acres) for conditional certifications. There are three actions available, Standard Certification (\$500), Conditional Certification (\$1000/acre up to 10 acres), and Denial.
3. Revise the petition process to include aggrieved parties, not just the applicant.
4. Bring the program into better compliance with CEQA, permit streamlining, the Clean Water Act and Porter-Cologne.

In general, staff recommends "Waiver of Certification" when the applicant proposes adequate mitigation. Measures included in the application must assure that beneficial uses will be protected, and water quality standards will be met.

Staff will recommend "No Action" when no discharge or adverse impacts are expected. Generally, a project must provide beneficial use and habitat enhancement for no action to be taken by the Regional Board. A chart on the following page lists applications received through October 31, 2000.

WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN SEPTEMBER 30 AND OCTOBER 31, 2000

| DATE RECEIVED | APPLICANT | PROJECT DESCRIPTION | PROJECT LOCATION | RECEIVING WATER | ACTION TAKEN |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| October 3, 2000 | Sousources Ranch | Build access road and install 3 drainage culverts | Santa Ynez | Zanja de Cota Creek | Standard Certification |
| October 4, 2000 | Carmel PWD | Bluff and Beach Access Protection Project | Carmel | Pacific Ocean | Pending |
| October 5, 2000 | Mountain view Center | Streambank stabilization project | San Luis Obispo | San Luis Obispo Creek | Pending |
| October 16, 2000 | Creek Bridge Homes | Construct residential subdivision involving filling drainage swale and installing stormdrain | San Juan Bautista | Unnamed perennial creek tributary to San Benito river | Pending |
| October 17, 2000 | City of Santa Barbara | Waterfront Area Sediment Management Program | Santa Barbara | Mission Creek, Pacific Ocean | Pending |
| October 17, 2000 | David Daniels | Construct road crossing and utilities across creek | Santa Maria | Unnamed Tributary to Orcutt Creek | Pending |
| October 24, 2000 | San Luis Obispo Co. Engineering Dept. | Morretti Canyon Road Bank Stabilization Project | San Luis Obispo | East Corral de Piedra Creek | Pending |
| October 24, 2000 | Caltrans | Highway 101 Improvement Project | Prunedale | Prunedale Creek | Pending |

(Watershed Branch Reports continued)

STATUS REPORTS

NPDES Storm Water Industrial Program [Jennifer Bitting 805/549-3334]

This report provides an update on the status of the NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program. Included is background information about the program, an overview of the permit, and a summary of the 1999-2000 Annual Report review.

Background

The Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of pollutants to waters of the U.S. without an NPDES permit. The 1987 amendments to the Clean Water Act established a framework for regulation of municipal and industrial storm water discharges. In November 1990, the U.S. EPA (USEPA) promulgated final regulations establishing application requirements for storm water permits. These regulations were implemented in California by the State Water Resources Control Board through the issuance of two general permits, one for industrial activities and one for construction activities. Under these permits, industrial facilities and construction sites are required to implement management measures in order to discharge storm water.

Permit Timeframe: The General Industrial Activities Storm Water Permit (General Industrial Permit) was first issued on November 19, 1991. The monitoring requirements for this permit were amended on September 17, 1992. The permit was issued for a five year term, and therefore, was reissued on May 1, 1997.

General Industrial Permit

Objectives: The goal of the General Industrial Permit is to prevent contamination of storm water runoff from industrial facilities. In order to accomplish this, facilities are required to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). This plan describes the potential pollutant sources present at the facility, along with the management measures, or Best Management Practices (BMPs), that are being implemented to prevent contact of these pollutants with storm

water. Facilities must also develop a monitoring program in accordance with the permit requirements. The goal of the monitoring program is to quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of the BMPs implemented on the site.

Who Must Comply: Compliance under the General Industrial Permit is required of specific industrial classes, determined by standard industrial classification codes. The major categories of industrial facilities include facilities subject to federal storm water effluent limitation guidelines; manufacturing facilities; mining/oil and gas facilities; hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities; landfills; recycling facilities; steam electric power generating facilities; transportation facilities that conduct vehicle maintenance; sewage or wastewater treatment works; and light industry sites where materials are exposed to storm water.

Effluent Limitations: There are no numerical effluent limitations for industrial storm water discharges. However, all facilities under the General Industrial Permit must meet all applicable provisions of Sections 301 and 402 of the Clean Water Act. These provisions require control of pollutant discharges using best available technology economically achievable (BAT) and best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) to prevent and reduce pollutants and any other more stringent controls necessary to meet water quality standards. Under the industrial permit, development and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) constitutes compliance with BAT and BCT. The State of California has established benchmark values for five constituents found in storm water. These benchmark values are used to measure the effectiveness of the BMPs.

Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans: All facility operators must prepare, retain on site, and implement an SWPPP. There are three main objectives of an SWPPP. First, the SWPPP identifies the sources of pollution that affect the

quality of industrial storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges. Second, the SWPPP describes and ensures the implementation of BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants in industrial storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges. Third, the SWPPP ensures the elimination or separate NPDES permitting of unauthorized non-storm water discharges. Unauthorized non-storm water discharges include waters from rinsing or washing of vehicles, equipment, buildings, or pavement; materials that have been improperly disposed of or dumped and spilled; and/or leaked materials. Authorized non-storm water discharges are discharges specifically listed in the General Industrial Permit which meet conditions designed to ensure minimal impact to storm water runoff.

The SWPPP must include provisions for conducting an Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation. This evaluation includes review of all monitoring data collected during the reporting year; a site inspection to verify implementation of BMPs; an evaluation of BMPs to determine adequacy and maintenance requirements; and, an evaluation report summarizing results of these activities.

Monitoring Program: All facility operators are required to develop and implement a monitoring program. The objectives of the monitoring program are to demonstrate compliance with the General Industrial Permit, aid in the implementation of the SWPPP, and measure the effectiveness of the BMPs in reducing or preventing pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges.

Facility operators are required to perform quarterly non-storm water discharge observations during dry periods to check for the presence of unauthorized non-storm water discharges and verify that BMPs are being effectively implemented for any authorized non-storm water discharges. They must also make monthly observations of storm water discharges from the facility during the eight months of the wet season (October through May).

Storm water discharge samples are required to be collected from the first storm of the wet season and one additional storm during the wet season. All samples are required to be analyzed for pH, Specific Conductance, Total Suspended Solids,

and either Total Organic Carbon or Oil and Grease. Samples may need to be analyzed for toxic chemicals and other pollutants likely to be present in storm water discharges in significant quantities, industry specific parameters listed in the industrial permit, and any other parameters required by the Regional Board on a site specific basis.

Annual Report: All monitoring information collected during the year is incorporated into an Annual Report that is submitted by July 1 each year. Any required activities not performed during the year are to be explained in the Annual Report. All visual monitoring forms, sample analytical reports, and the Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation report are to be included.

Group Monitoring: Similar industrial sites can form a group monitoring program in order to reduce analytical costs to the individual sites. These groups are made up of facilities that have the same types of industrial activities and pollutant sources, and are expected to have similar analytical results for storm water discharge samples. Group monitoring programs are approved by the Regional Boards, or by the State Water Resources Control Board if group members fall in more than one region. As a member of a group, all monitoring and reporting requirements must be met, except that each facility is only required to collect two samples over the five year term of the industrial permit.

1999-2000 Annual Report Review

There are 407 facilities in the Central Coast Region that hold an Industrial Storm Water Permit. On August 1, 121 Notice of Violation letters were sent to facilities that had not yet turned in their annual report. By September 1, there were only twenty-four facilities that still had not turned in their annual report, and Notice of Violation letters were sent to them certified mail. By October 1, only five facilities' annual reports were still outstanding. Two certified mail letters were returned unclaimed and were served by the Sheriff. One certified mail letter was lost in the mail and was re-sent certified mail, the annual report was received a few days later. Administrative Civil Liability Complaints were written for the remaining two facilities.

There are eight counties in the Central Coast Region (not counting small segments of Kern County). The workplan called for one county's annual reports to be reviewed. All annual reports for six counties were reviewed. Staff evaluated the information submitted in the annual reports. Site-specific response letters were generated. The following numbers and types of response letters were issued: Twenty Notices of Violation for major compliance problems, 118 deficiency letters for all minor compliance issues, and twenty-four sites were put on a mandatory inspection list due to questionable discharges reported. These letters were sent out before the end of October so that facilities received feedback before the wet season.

The results of the sample data are as follows:

| Constituent | Average value |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| pH | 7.26 |
| Total Suspended Solids | 274 mg/L |
| Specific Conductance | 494 μ mhos/cm |
| Total Organic Carbon | 44 mg/L |
| Oil & Grease | 9 mg/L |

The benchmark values for storm water are as follows:

| Constituents | Acceptable Range | Need for Concern |
|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| pH | 6.5-8.5 | <6.5 or >8.5 |
| TSS | <100 | >100 |
| SC | <200 | >300 |
| TOC | <35 | >100 |
| O&G | <10 | >20 |

Total Suspended Solids and Specific Conductance were found to be, on average, outside the benchmark values. Deficiency letters were sent to every discharger that reported storm water discharges with constituents outside benchmark values, asking them to reevaluate their Best Management Practices.

Duke Energy, Moss Landing Power Plant, Monterey County (Surge Pipe Status) [Lida Tan [805/542-4785]

During the Duke Energy Moss Landing Power Plant NPDES permit hearing on October 27, 2000,

concerns were raised about the surge chambers on the cooling water discharge outfall. Regional Board and California Department of Fish & Game staff inspected the surge chambers on October 30, 2000.

There are three sets of surge chambers along the cooling water discharge lines for Units 6 & 7. The surge chambers were installed to prevent air pressure buildup by allowing air to vent through the chambers. During high tidal periods, cooling water in the discharge lines may be pushed back by the strong tidal forces and, inevitably, splashes out from the U-shaped vents on top of the surge chambers (see Attachments 1, 2, 3). The surge chambers have been in place since the 1960's when Units 6 & 7 were built.

The first set of surge chambers (#1) is located on the beach, approximately 300 feet from the shoreline. The chambers are about four feet in diameter and three feet above the ground. When the cooling water splashes from the surge chambers, it drains directly onto the beach. During high tidal periods, the first set of chambers would receive most of the surging cooling water. The second set of surge chambers (#2) is located in the harbor. The dimensions are identical to the first chambers. Strong surges cause the cooling water to splash onto the asphalt that drains to the harbor, ten feet away.

On October 27, 2000, Duke Energy replaced the #1 and #2 surge chamber tops with six feet tall cylinders (see Attachments 1 and 2). Staff noticed little cooling water splashing out from the cylinders during high tides, with a fairly strong swell. Duke Energy plans to completely seal the cylinders to prevent cooling water releases.

During the recent inspection, staff observed that the cooling water released was about 10-15 degrees warmer than ambient harbor water temperature. Given the sporadic nature of the surges and varying seasonal tidal forces, it is difficult to estimate the amount of cooling water discharged into the harbor. Staff conservatively estimates that up to 2,000 gallons of cooling water may have been released sporadically into the harbor daily through the surge chamber vents, prior to Duke's recent changes to eliminate or minimize discharge. The average daily cooling water discharge through the Monterey Bay outfall

is about 689 million gallons. Staff agrees with California Department of Fish & Game staff that the relatively small amount (a little more than a gallon a minute) of warm cooling water would disperse quickly in the harbor and did not result in significant water quality impacts. This quantity is probably significantly less than the cooling water discharged from boats using the harbor every day.

The third set of surge chambers (#3) is located west of Highway 1. The chambers are about 15 feet in diameter and two feet above the ground. Cooling water is about 20-25 feet below the surface level. No modification has been made on these two surge chambers because cooling water has never been released from them (see Attachment 3).

Staff has asked Duke Energy to complete the modifications of the existing surge chambers and ensure that no additional cooling water is released, as specified in the Permit Order 00-041. Duke Energy will submit a written report by November 10, 2000. Staff will determine if additional action is warranted after reviewing the report.

Carmel Area Waste Water District [Chris Adair 805/549-3761]

The District sent a letter (see Attachment 4) regarding the permit the Board adopted this year.

Cleanup Branch Reports

LOW THREAT DISCHARGES

This section is for dischargers who have requested approval to discharge water that poses insignificant threat to water quality or for sites recommended for case closure (low risk sites where no further regulatory action is required). Consequently, we conditionally approved of these proposals. Conditions common to each approval are:

1. If you, the Regional Board, object to the proposal, an NPDES permit or waste discharge requirements will be prepared for the Board's consideration.

2. The discharger remains liable for any treatment system failure that results in significant discharge of pollutants.
3. We have a "low threat discharges" general permit for surface water discharges available, and the discharger may be required to file for coverage by that permit.

Site descriptions and specific conditions are listed below for each case.

Request by Chevron Products Company to Discharge Treated Groundwater from Service Station No. 9-2805 to an Offsite Storm Drain at 165 North Fairview Avenue, Goleta Santa Barbara County [Richard Aleshire 805/542-4631]

Chevron Products Company proposes to discharge highly treated (potable quality) groundwater from a groundwater treatment system to a storm drain at the above-noted site under the terms of the Board's General Permit for Discharges With Low Threat to Water Quality (NPDES Permit No. CAG993001, WDR Order No. 96-4). Up to 15 gallons per minute of gasoline contaminated groundwater will be treated in a series of six 1,000-pound carbon treatments (a double-redundant treatment system), and discharged to a storm drain just offsite, which drains to Las Vegas Creek. All property owners within 300 feet of the site have been notified. Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 00-157 has been issued to Chevron Products Company to verify compliance with the Low Threat Permit. Unless the Regional Board has objection, staff will issue a letter to Chevron advising that coverage under the General Permit may begin.

CASE CLOSURES FOR ABOVE AND UNDERGROUND TANKS (UGT), AND SPILLS, LEAKS, INVESTIGATIONS AND CLEANUPS (SLIC)

This section is formatted to easily identify sites where staff is recommending case closure concurrence from the Board. Case closures generally fall into two categories - cases where cleanup goals have been met and cases where cleanup goals have not been met. In the first case, staff generally sends the responsible party a letter stating the case is now closed since cleanup objectives have been met and no further action is

needed. Unless the Board objects, staff will continue to send closure letters and simply report these cases by way of the Executive Officer's report.

The second situation occurs where cleanup objectives are not yet met, but for various reasons, staff is recommending closure. These cases will be reported to the Board in more detail. For example, staff has discovered that some sites have a plume of contamination confined to a defined area. Ground water monitoring may show the plume is decreasing both in concentration and size, and does not threaten probable beneficial uses. Other specific circumstances may exist such as the plume may be confined to a shallow portion of the aquifer with no actual or expected uses of the groundwater. The reasons for staff recommending closure will be explained with each case.

We are presenting these closures in a manner similar to the way we present waivers of waste discharge requirements. That is, the case will be discussed and if the Board does not object to a case or wishes more information, the issue may be discussed at the Board meeting where we can provide clarification or the Board may reject our recommendation for closure.

Abbreviations commonly used for these cases:

TPH - Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons

TPHd - TPH measured in the carbon range of diesel

TPHg - TPH measured in the carbon range of gasoline

BTEX - Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylene (components of gasoline)

MTBE - Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (gasoline oxygenate additive)

DCA or 1,2, DCA - dichloroethane (gasoline additive)

DCE - dichloroethylene (gasoline additive)

PCE -tetrachloroethylene or perchloroethylene (perc - a solvent)

TCE - trichloroethylene (a solvent)

TCA - trichloroethane (a solvent)

Case Recommended for Closure

Equiva Services LLC, Shell Service Station, 850 Pacheco Pass Highway, Gilroy, Santa Clara County [John Mijares 805/549-3696]

In late 1986, three monitoring wells were installed at the site in response to Santa Clara County's ordinance. Results of ground water samples from the monitoring wells show high concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons [benzene 3,200 parts per billion (ppb), toluene 3,500 ppb, and xylene 9,100 ppb]. On May 7, 1987, the Executive Officer (EO) issued Cleanup or Abatement Order (CAO) No. 87-117 requiring Shell Oil Company (Shell) to initiate ground water cleanup forthwith. On August 11, 1987, the Executive Officer issued to Shell CAO 87-157, which contains ground water cleanup levels for the site. On September 4, 1987, the Board ratified cleanup levels contained in CAO 87-157. In response to the CAOs, Shell initiated in March 1988, operation of the ground water extraction and treatment system and initiated operation of a soil vapor extraction system in February 1990. Both of these remediation systems were in operation until late 1993. Regional Board staff transferred in November 1993 oversight responsibilities for site remediation to the Santa Clara Valley Water District (District) under the Underground Storage Tank Local Oversight Program.

On September 28, 2000, the District submitted to Regional Board staff a written request for closure of the above-noted site. District staff reports that, based on confirmation sampling, residual petroleum hydrocarbon contamination remains in soil at 1,600 parts per million (ppm) total petroleum hydrocarbon as gasoline (TPHG), and 3.1 ppm benzene. Residual petroleum hydrocarbon contamination remain in ground water at 360 ppb TPHG, 9.2 ppb benzene, 4.7 ppb toluene, 0.9 ppb ethylbenzene, and 5.8 ppb xylenes. Methyl tertiary-butyl ether (MTBE) was not detected in ground water. District staff concludes the dissolved petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations have decreased to levels below, or approaching, cleanup levels (10,000 ppb TPHG, 3.5 ppb benzene, 500 ppb toluene, 3,400 ppb ethylbenzene, and 3,100 ppb xylenes) contained in the Regional Board's Cleanup or Abatement Order No. 87-157. Based on the current concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbon contaminants in ground water, only benzene exceeds the cleanup level of 3.5 ppb. SCVWD staff concludes that based on data presented, the residual ground water contamination remaining at the site does not appear to be a significant threat to ground water, human health, and the environment. The 9.2 ppb benzene was

detected in interior monitoring well S-3 during the October 1999 sampling event. This contamination is localized in the vicinity of well S-3 since benzene was not detected (<0.5 ppb) in seven of the eight monitoring wells downgradient of well S-3. The other downgradient monitoring well has a concentration of 0.7 ppb benzene. The City of Gilroy has a standby production well located about 1000 feet downgradient of the source area and the eight downgradient monitoring wells.

Since the site is still an operating Shell service station, District staff further recommends keeping at least three monitoring wells for periodic ground water monitoring. Continued monitoring at a reduced frequency, at least once per year, will provide early detection of any future leaks from the underground storage tanks and piping. The District will have continued oversight in reviewing ground water reports and taking appropriate follow up action at this site.

Based on District's recommendation, absence of MTBE in ground water, and our review of available data, Board staff concurs with the recommendation to close the site and keep at least three monitoring wells for periodic monitoring. If the Board does not object to this recommendation, staff will inform SCVWD of the Board's concurrence to close the site and the Executive Officer will rescind CAO Nos. 87-117 and 87-157.

Castlerock Estates, 154 Corral De Tierra, Salinas, Monterey County [John Mijares 805/549-3696]

The subject site is located along Highway 68 approximately nine miles southwest of Salinas within the Markham Ranch Subdivision. The 12.3-acre site was formerly a working ranch for cattle and sheep. It is bordered on the north by Castlerock Road and on the south by a creek. The site is undeveloped due to the presence of pesticide residues in soil from the use of toxaphene and dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) in dipping solutions for cattle and sheep. Livestock dipping in cattle troughs began in the 1930's and continued through the mid-1970's. Large homes are on many of the surrounding parcels. Topography on and around the site is rolling hills with oak trees.

Investigations conducted between 1991 through 1995 had shown toxaphene and combined DDT, DDE, and DDD compounds were in soil and ground water. Toxaphene concentrations in surface soil near the cattle dip trough had ranged from 10 to 1000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg), with concentrations sometimes exceeding 1000 mg/kg in surficial soil immediately adjacent to the dip trough. Toxaphene concentrations in soil generally have been higher than DDT compounds by an order of magnitude in the same soil sample.

A perched shallow aquifer under the site flows west-northwest and levels fluctuate seasonally from four to fourteen feet below ground surface. The lithologic material consists of discontinuous and interfingering clay, silt and sand lenses. Ground water samples collected in February and March 1992 found toxaphene ranging from 2.6 to 49 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/l}$). There are a total of eight monitoring wells installed at the site ranging in depth from 15 to 17 feet below ground surface (bgs).

Nearby production wells for domestic water supply and irrigation purposes are at depths of 340 to 500 feet bgs. Data from these wells show that useable ground water is encountered at depths of 175 feet and deeper. The Monterey County Department of Health Services requires that production wells installed in the area have a minimum sanitary seal to a depth of 50 feet bgs. Water samples collected in 1992 from a domestic well located 300 feet southwest of the dip trough, the Castlerock Estates water system, and from a creek south of the site have no reportable concentrations of toxaphene.

On September 6, 1996, the Board adopted Cleanup or Abatement Order (CAO) No. 96-22 for Castlerock Estates, Inc (Castlerock). The CAO requires Castlerock to cleanup degraded soil and ground water to meet soil and ground water cleanup levels contained in the CAO for toxaphene, and the combined DDT, DDE and DDD compounds. The toxaphene cleanup levels are 0.3 mg/kg for soil and 5 $\mu\text{g/l}$ for ground water. The cleanup levels for the combined DDT, DDE, and DDD compounds are 0.03 mg/kg in soil and 1 $\mu\text{g/l}$ in ground water. The CAO further requires Castlerock to remove the concrete dip trough and the surrounding soils which have toxaphene concentrations exceeding 1,500 mg/kg before

conducting a study to determine the viability of using bioremediation to achieve soil and ground water cleanup levels contained in the CAO.

On October 18, and 19, 1996, Castlerock removed the concrete dip trough and 52 tons of contaminated soil in compliance with the CAO and disposed of the waste at a Class I landfill near Kettleman City. Castlerock initiated the contaminated soil bioremediation pilot study on October 1996. Results of soil analysis after 10 months of the bioremediation pilot study, show that the remaining toxaphene and DDT concentrations are about two and three orders of magnitude higher, respectively, than the soil cleanup levels in the CAO. Therefore, in September 1997, Board staff directed Castlerock to excavate and dispose of the pesticide-contaminated soil in accordance with the CAO. In response to staff directive, Castlerock, hired an environmental consultant to direct site assessment and the complete excavation of pesticide contaminated soil.

On December 15, 1999, and October 13, 2000, Castlerock's environmental consultant submitted reports that confirm the complete excavation and disposal of pesticide-contaminated soil. The soil that remains at the site complies with the CAO soil cleanup levels of 0.3 mg/kg of toxaphene and 0.03 mg/kg for the combined DDT, DDE, and DDE compounds. A total of about 9,200 tons of pesticide contaminated soil have been removed from the site and disposed of to an appropriate disposal area.

Results of the April 2000 ground water monitoring show that toxaphene concentrations in all wells except for two (MW-3 and MW-8) met water quality objectives. MW-3 (5.1 µg/l) and MW-8 (7.1 µg/l) still exceed the toxaphene ground water cleanup level of 5 µg/l contained in the CAO. Concentrations of the combined DDT, DDE, and DDD compounds in these two wells were below the ground water cleanup level of 1 µg/l. Although, concentrations of toxaphene in the two monitoring wells still exceed the ground water cleanup level, staff believes compliance is imminent since the source area of the contamination has been removed with the removal of the pesticide-contaminated soil.

If the Board does not object, the Executive Officer will proceed with site closure (after destruction of the two remaining monitoring wells) and will schedule recision of the CAO at the next Board meeting.

STATUS REPORTS

Unocal Guadalupe Oil Field Cleanup, Santa Barbara County [Katie Anderson 805/549-3690]

Summary - The following is a status report of Unocal's Guadalupe oil field cleanup. This information was current on October 26, 2000.

Site Characterization- Unocal and Regional Board staff continue to meet at least twice monthly in facilitated meetings to discuss site characterization.

Unocal is pursuing upland well pad restoration, required as part of the County of San Luis Obispo's land use permit. Unocal has completed initial work at three upland pad sites, focused on assessing well pad suitability for restoration. Unocal has submitted a workplan for well pad U12 restoration, and staff is reviewing the workplan.

Work continues on ecological and human health risk assessments. Bioassays are being completed and results will be reported in December 2000. These bioassays should provide valuable information on the toxicity of contaminated soils and water.

Demonstration tests for biological treatment of excavated soils are nearing the end of the 100-day test period. The results of the six demonstration tests are expected in a report by December 2000. If the tests are successful, Unocal will proceed with full-scale permitting and implementation.

CAO Compliance - The current phase of excavation focuses on the beach area. Unocal has completed excavation of the A2A North diluent plume, LeRoy 6 sump, and A2A sump. Unocal has also divided the 5X East excavation into two cells to facilitate equipment movement and soil handling. The smaller cell has been completed and backfilled. Unocal has begun contaminated soil removal in the larger cell. Unocal will complete this set of excavations by March 2001. At that point, cleanup

of contaminated areas nearest the ocean will be complete.

(See Attachment 5).

Ballard Canyon Landfill, Santa Barbara County
[Hector Hernandez 805/542-4641]

The following status report was updated on October 25, 2000.

Site Investigation Status: Santa Barbara County has completed its site assessment activities and will submit a final site assessment report by November 15, 2000.

Site Preparation for the Winter: The County is close to completing winter preparedness activities. The County has trucked in soil material and filled all low spots and graded the landfill site. The site will be seeded to promote vegetation and minimize erosion of imported soils. These actions will help minimize water infiltration and the creation of leachate.

Site Cleanup: The County is required to construct and operate an interim gas recovery system by April 1, 2001. The County is performing two feasibility studies prior to selection of final cleanup systems. One study is to evaluate landfill closure alternatives and the other will address ground water cleanup. Closure alternatives will be studied and implemented prior to selecting a final cleanup alternative.

Air Quality Issues and Outside Agency Support: Regional Board staff is working with the County, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the Integrated Waste Management Board (Waste Board), and the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) to address landfill gas issues and to establish an effective gas-monitoring program.

Offsite Pumping: In response to a Regional Board directive, the County continues to study off-site groundwater pumping in the immediate landfill vicinity. Staff has required that the County complete its evaluation and submit a complete summary of the evaluation results by April 30, 2001. The evaluation summary must include recommendations for corrective measures if

necessary and a reasonable implementation schedule for all proposed activities.

Larner Domestic/Irrigation Well: In accordance with a Regional Board directive to control migration of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in ground water towards the Larner well, the County installed a replacement water supply well on Mr. Larner's property. However, pumping information indicates that the well may only be pumped at approximately 30 to 40 gallons per minute (GPM). Since Mr. Larner's existing well is pumped at up to 90 GPM, the replacement well may not be adequate. The County has agreed to seek alternatives to achieve full compliance with the Regional Board directive. In the interim, Regional Board staff has advised Mr. Larner and his attorney to maximize the use of the replacement well and only pump the original Larner well if and when absolutely necessary.

By November 10, 2000, the County will provide a detailed plan to achieve full compliance with the Regional Board directive. The County intends to supplement the replacement well by providing an additional 50 to 60 GPM. Once the County provides Mr. Larner with sufficient water supply, Regional Board staff intends to direct Mr. Larner to cease pumping his original well.

Outstanding Litigation: Litigation continues between several property owners near the landfill site and the County of Santa Barbara. Three separate lawsuits filed against the County remain unresolved and include the following parties: (1) Several home owners, represented by Mr. Richard Kravetz; (2) Mr. Stevan Larner, represented by Mr. John Dorwin; and (3) Mr./Mrs. Raymond Dries, represented by Mr. Jack Collison.

(See Attachments 6 and 7).

Underground Tanks Summary Report dated October 24, 2000 [Jay Cano 805/549-3699]

(See Attachment 8).

Regionwide Reports

California Biodiversity Council [Roger Briggs 805/549-3140]

This council is chaired by Resources Agency Secretary Mary Nichols. The meeting is scheduled for November 8 and 9, 2000, in Santa Barbara, with a focus on non-point source issues and Marine Protected Areas. Roger Briggs and Mike Higgins are attending.

Regional Monitoring [Karen Worcester 805/549-3333]

Karen Worcester, Mary Adams, and Dave Paradies attended an all-day technical session in Moss Landing on details of the new Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP). Karen gave a presentation on proposed monitoring activities to be funded in Region 3 in 2001, and also demonstrated "DataMon", our data management program developed by Dave Paradies. The Department of Fish and Game, which will be serving as Master Contractor to conduct SWAMP monitoring work, seeks to use this tool as their initial data management system for SWAMP. The software tool provides easy utilities for uploading data into STORET (Storage and Retrieval system), the data archive utilized by US EPA. STORET is currently proposed as the backbone for storing water quality data in the State Board's new System for Water Information Management (SWIM II). All seven Regions represented at the meeting agreed that use of our tool would be very desirable.

We also presented our data management system at an EPA STORET training for State and Regional Board staff. Again, consensus was that this would be a very useful intermediary tool for storing data at the desktop prior to upload to STORET. The unfortunate consequence of all this positive feedback is that we are receiving numerous calls from people in other Regions in dire need of something like this system. We are discussing with the Department of Fish and Game and the Office of Information Technology the need for a staff person dedicated to providing technical support and interface to other Regions to take the burden off of Dave, our volunteer.

Karen helped Howard Kolb convert Santa Cruz County data, discharger (Santa Cruz Biotechnology) data, and data from other sources into the Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program (CCAMP) format for analysis prior to the

October Board meeting. We have also provided data management support to State Parks staff, who are collecting water quality data in the Santa Barbara area.

Karen conducted a final editing and sent out the Monterey Bay Area Dischargers (MBAD) proposed monitoring program in a mailing to Interested Parties in advance of the November Board meeting, where it will be presented. As of October 31, only one written comment has been received. After requests from MBAD members for Regional Board assistance, Karen, Brad Hagemann, and Roger Briggs worked with MBAD members on resolving conflicts of program cost allocations. We are recommending costs be allocated according to a baseline fee plus a flow-weighted fee. The group will meet to decide the final cost allocation on November 1st.

The CCAMP team attended a three-day workshop in Long Beach entitled "Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation of Sediment Quality Data." The conference provided practical information on incorporating sediment quality data into a monitoring program. Emphasis was placed on use of "synoptic" sampling; that is, conducting chemical monitoring along with other measurements of impairment, such as toxicity testing, bioassessment, and bioaccumulation. We are utilizing this approach in our CCAMP sampling, though we are not fully funded for all elements. Numeric standards and Sediment Quality Guidelines were major topics of discussion as well. This year's Mussel Watch sites have been selected and mussels will be deployed soon. Sites have been selected along the Santa Barbara coastline and in San Antonio Creek and Santa Ynez River. We are moving into the Santa Barbara rotation area in 2001, and are scheduling a meeting for November with agencies involved in monitoring activities. We will discuss our proposed sites and monitoring activities and seek input from others on any suggestions they might have. We will also coordinate with existing monitoring activities, encourage use of uniform data structures, and coordinate sharing of existing databases.

Proposition 13 Funding Update [Alison Jones 805/542-4646]

On November 2, the State Board released the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the first round of Proposition 13 grants. The RFP has been mailed

electronically to 1600 recipients and has been posted on the State Board web site (www.swrcb.ca.gov). Hard copies will be available at Regional Board offices. Grant programs and amounts are Watershed Protection (\$8.4 million), Nonpoint Source Pollution Control (\$9.2 million) and Coastal Nonpoint Source Control (\$2.2 million). A summary table of the programs is attached. Watershed planning proposals are encouraged for the first funding round within the Watershed Protection category.

State and Regional Boards will offer Proposition 13 RFP public workshops in late November and early December. Dates and locations will be made available soon. The proposal submittal deadline is February 1, 2001. It is anticipated that project implementation could begin by November 1, 2001. A second RFP for the same programs with larger dollar amounts will be released in the spring of 2001. Alison Jones is Region 3's designated Proposition 13 contact person.

(See Attachment 9)

Administrative Reports

[Requirements Backlog Status \[Roger Briggs 805/549-3140\]](#)

At the Water Quality Coordinating Meeting, Ed Anton said the backlog, of requirements that are due for review, is growing and the regions need to

Award Recipient

Angela Carpenter
Wei Lui
Hector Hernandez
Mark Angelo
Sheila Soderberg
Matt Fabry
Katheryn Anderson
Diane Glanville
Ron Sherer
Carol Hewitt
John Robertson

Award

Watershed Branch Award
Cleanup Branch Award
Employee of the Quarter
Rookie of the Year/Watershed Branch
Rookie of the Year/Cleanup Branch
Outstanding Presentation(s)/Watershed Branch
Outstanding Presentation(s)/Cleanup Branch
Behind the Scenes
Beyond the Call of Duty
Attitude Award
Superior Accomplishment Award

Staff also participated in a number of team building exercises lead by "coach" Alison Jones.

reverse that trend. Our Central Coast Region backlog has never been excessive. We have been able to keep up with the scheduled reviews with only a few exceptions for unusual cases (e.g., Diablo Canyon, Buena Vista Mines).

STAFF RECOGNITION

On August 31, we held our 2nd annual Staff Recognition BBQ at Cuesta Park in San Luis Obispo. This year, the Recognition BBQ was spear-headed by the Central Watershed Unit. Following is a summary of the awards presented:

ATTACHMENTS

1. Duke/Moss Landing #1 Set Surge Chambers
2. Duke/Moss Landing #2 Set Surge Chambers
3. Duke/Moss Landing #3 Set Surge Chambers
4. CAWD Letter dated November 7, 2000
5. Unocal Guadalupe Site Location Map
6. Ballard Canyon Site Location Map
7. Ballard Canyon Well Location Map
8. Underground Tanks Summary Report
9. Proposition 13 Request for Proposal Exhibits