

Water Board Responses to California Public Comments

November 2, 2010

3. City of South Lake Tahoe



City of South Lake Tahoe

"making a positive difference now"

September 13, 2010

Douglas F. Smith
Chief TMDL and Basin Planning Unit
Lahontan Water Board
DFsmith@waterboards.ca.gov

RE: COMMENTS ON BASIN PLAN AMENDMENTS-LAKE TAHOE TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

The City of South Lake Tahoe (City) welcomes the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed Basin Plan (BP) amendments which include a draft Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediment and Nutrients (LTTMDL) as well as other documents that comprise a Substitute Environmental Document for the Lake Tahoe TMDL project per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As requested in your July 9, 2010 "Notice of Public Hearing and Notice of Filing of Draft Environmental Documents", written comments are being submitted in MS Word by e-mail. A printed version will also be mailed. To facilitate review, we are using the following formatting when discussing text language proposed by Lahontan Water Board or City staff.

Existing BP or Final TMDL Report text is shown in *italics*
Lahontan's proposal for Added text shown as *underlined italics*
Lahontan's proposal for Deleted text is shown in ~~*strikethrough italics*~~.

City's proposed additions are shown as ***bold underlined text in italics***
City's proposed deletions are shown as ~~***bold-strikethrough-text-in-italics***~~.

Comments and Discussion on summary of proposed changes to the Basin Plan described in the four-page long July 9, 2010 notice on Proposed Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region: Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load

City staff support the changes to the approach to restore Lake Tahoe which:

- Identify fine sediment particles (FSP) as a discrete pollutant in addition to nitrogen and phosphorus
- Replaces the 20-year compliance date ending in 2007 approach with a TMDL Implementation Plan Timeline
- Eliminates numeric effluent limits for stormwater discharges to infiltration systems, thereby removing a disincentive to using infiltration as a preferred an effective stormwater treatment
- Eliminates numeric effluent limits for Total Iron and Oil and Grease, noting that receiving water standards are more stringent

Comment



City of South Lake Tahoe

"making a positive difference now"

September 13, 2010

Douglas F. Smith
Chief TMDL and Basin Planning Unit
Lahontan Water Board
DFsmith@waterboards.ca.gov

RE: COMMENTS ON BASIN PLAN AMENDMENTS-LAKE TAHOE TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD

The City of South Lake Tahoe (City) welcomes the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed Basin Plan (BP) amendments which include a draft Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediment and Nutrients (LTTMDL) as well as other documents that comprise a Substitute Environmental Document for the Lake Tahoe TMDL project per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As requested in your July 9, 2010 "Notice of Public Hearing and Notice of Filing of Draft Environmental Documents", written comments are being submitted in MS Word by e-mail. A printed version will also be mailed. To facilitate review, we are using the following formatting when discussing text language proposed by Lahontan Water Board or City staff.

Existing BP or Final TMDL Report text is shown in *italics*
Lahontan's proposal for Added text shown as *underlined italics*
Lahontan's proposal for Deleted text is shown in ~~*strikethrough italics*~~.

City's proposed additions are shown as ***bold underlined text in italics***
City's proposed deletions are shown as ~~***bold strikethrough text in italics***~~.

Comments and Discussion on summary of proposed changes to the Basin Plan described in the four-page long July 9, 2010 notice on Proposed Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region: Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load

City staff support the changes to the approach to restore Lake Tahoe which:

- Identify fine sediment particles (FSP) as a discrete pollutant in addition to nitrogen and phosphorus
- Replaces the 20-year compliance date ending in 2007 approach with a TMDL Implementation Plan Timeline
- Eliminates numeric effluent limits for stormwater discharges to infiltration systems, thereby removing a disincentive to using infiltration as a preferred an effective stormwater treatment
- Eliminates numeric effluent limits for Total Iron and Oil and Grease, noting that receiving water standards are more stringent

Response

- Allow municipal stormwater permittees flexibility in prioritizing load reduction actions and in selecting design storms for catchment scale activities and projects.

Specific comments:

Page 2 – 5. Eliminate Numeric Effluent Limits for Stormwater Discharges to Infiltration Systems

6th paragraph-

In the event there isn't sufficient separation between infiltration systems and groundwater levels, the Basin Plan ensures water quality protection by stating that when the separation between infiltration systems and groundwater is less than five (5) feet, discharges may be required to meet effluent limits for discharges to surface waters.

No change to BP language is proposed. City staff support the existing language allowing Water Board discretion in applying effluent limits through the “*may be required*” phrase. However, TRPA code does not appear to allow this flexibility. For industrial sites where high pollutant concentrations would be expected, additional pre-treatment should be required. For less developed sites, expensive pre-treatment may not be needed. Please report on progress in getting Lahontan and TRPA rules to be consistent. If all discharges in areas with high seasonal water tables are required to be treated to meet surface water effluent limits, there would be little incentive to construct stormwater spreading or infiltration facilities which, for much of the year, would be effective in reducing pollutant loads discharged to Lake Tahoe.

Comments and Discussion on Proposed BP amendments

The proposed BP amendments include a new section 5.18 “Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediments and Nutrients, Lake Tahoe, El Dorado and Placer Counties” and changes to existing BP language

New Section 5.18 TMDL for Sediment and Nutrients, Lake Tahoe

Table 5.18.2, 5.18.3, and 5.18.4 on Page 7

These tables show baseline loads and milestone load reductions by pollutant source category and are summarized in the table below.

Pollutant Source	Fine Sediment Particles		Total Nitrogen (TN)			Total Phosphorus (TP)			
	basin-wide load	reduction @ year	basin-wide load	reduction @ year 65		basin-wide load	reduction @ year 65		
		15	65		15	65	15	65	
Forest Upland	9%	<i>12%</i>	<i>20%</i>	18%	<i>0%</i>	<i>0%</i>	32%	1%	3%
Urban Upland	72%	34%	71%	18%	<i>19%</i>	<i>50%</i>	47%	21%	46%
Atmosphere	16%	39%	55%	63%	<i>1%</i>	<i>2%</i>	18%	33%	<i>61%</i>

Bold underlined italics indicates disproportionately high reduction, *italics* indicates disproportionately low reduction. For example, though producing only 18% of TN loads, urban uplands need to reduce TN loads by 50% by year 65; atmospheric sources which

Comment

Response

- Allow municipal stormwater permittees flexibility in prioritizing load reduction actions and in selecting design storms for catchment scale activities and projects.

Specific comments:

Page 2 – 5. Eliminate Numeric Effluent Limits for Stormwater Discharges to Infiltration Systems

6th paragraph-

In the event there isn't sufficient separation between infiltration systems and groundwater levels, the Basin Plan ensures water quality protection by stating that when the separation between infiltration systems and groundwater is less than five (5) feet, discharges may be required to meet effluent limits for discharges to surface waters.

No change to BP language is proposed. City staff support the existing language allowing Water Board discretion in applying effluent limits through the "may be required" phrase. However, TRPA code does not appear to allow this flexibility. For industrial sites where high pollutant concentrations would be expected, additional pre-treatment should be required. For less developed sites, expensive pre-treatment may not be needed. Please report on progress in getting Lahontan and TRPA rules to be consistent. If all discharges in areas with high seasonal water tables are required to be treated to meet surface water effluent limits, there would be little incentive to construct stormwater spreading or infiltration facilities which, for much of the year, would be effective in reducing pollutant loads discharged to Lake Tahoe.

CSLT-1: Water Board staff are actively working with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to address regulatory inconsistencies. Federal funding is supporting a research project to determine how much separation is appropriate between the bottom of infiltration facilities and seasonal high groundwater.

CSLT-2: Refer to Response CSLT-1

Comments and Discussion on Proposed BP amendments

The proposed BP amendments include a new section 5.18 "Total Maximum Daily Load for Sediments and Nutrients, Lake Tahoe, El Dorado and Placer Counties" and changes to existing BP language

New Section 5.18 TMDL for Sediment and Nutrients, Lake Tahoe

Table 5.18.2, 5.18.3, and 5.18.4 on Page 7

These tables show baseline loads and milestone load reductions by pollutant source category and are summarized in the table below.

Pollutant Source	Fine Sediment Particles		Total Nitrogen (TN)			Total Phosphorus (TP)		
	basin-wide load	reduction @ year	basin-wide load	reduction @ year 65	basin-wide load	reduction @ year 65	15	65
Forest Upland	9%	<i>12%</i> <i>20%</i>	18%	<i>0%</i> <i>0%</i>	32%	<i>1%</i> <i>3%</i>		
Urban Upland	72%	<i>34%</i> <i>71%</i>	18%	<i>19%</i> <i>50%</i>	47%	<i>21%</i> <i>46%</i>		
Atmosphere	16%	<i>39%</i> <i>55%</i>	63%	<i>1%</i> <i>2%</i>	18%	<i>33%</i> <i>61%</i>		

Bold underlined italics indicates disproportionately high reduction, *italics* indicates disproportionately low reduction. For example, though producing only 18% of TN loads, urban uplands need to reduce TN loads by 50% by year 65; atmospheric sources which

CSLT-3: The Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report describes the most up-to-date analysis of load reduction options for the major pollutant source categories. The Water Board is not aware of any effective and practical measures to reduce loads from forested uplands and atmospheric sources that were missed during that analysis. If such opportunities arise in the future, the Water Board may exercise its discretion to revisit the pollutant load allocations to reflect new information. Please note that actions taken by the municipalities to meet the reductions in fine sediment particles should be sufficient to meet most of the load reductions required for reductions in other source categories.

produce 63% of TN loads are only required to reduce loads by 2% by year 65 and Forest Uplands, also responsible for 18% of TN loading, are not required to reduce any TN loads. Though we recognize that Lahontan staff has referred to the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (2008) and other TMDL reports in responding to questions on how the load reductions were allocated to pollutant sources, additional efforts to consider load reductions from forested uplands and atmospheric sources should be evaluated.

For example, in discussing the Characterization of Emission Sources in the Atmospheric Sources Section 2 (page 37) of the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (PRO report), the dominant source of resuspended dust from bare and disturbed surfaces in the Basin is identified as construction, and windblown dust from logging is considered to be negligible. Therefore, the PRO report addressed only the atmospheric dust load-reduction potential for control measures for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with construction sites, and did not appear to adequately address opportunities to reduce similar loads coming from disturbed areas within forested lands.

In the current economic conditions there is relatively little construction activity in the Tahoe Basin. After the 2007 Angora Fire, there has been an increased emphasis on the legitimate need for substantial fuels reduction in the basin. There are, and are likely to continue to be, significant soil disturbance associated with fuels reduction activities in forested areas. A comparison of the acreage of urban lands under construction to the acreage of fuels reduction treatment would be useful. Control measures should be considered for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with fuel reduction activities in forested uplands, particularly those adjacent to urbanized areas, roads and surface waters. These control measures could be similar to measures that would be used to reduce atmospheric dust associated with construction projects. Larger load reduction milestones should be considered for forested uplands and/or atmospheric sources.

Margin of Safety and Future Growth Potential – Page 8

This section notes that future build-out of all developable vacant private lots under existing regulations would only increase FSP loads by 2%. Please clarify whether the Lake Tahoe Watershed Model assumes that BMPs installed on newly developed parcels would be adequately maintained to prevent additional pollutant loads. One of the strategies to reduce urban upland pollutant loads from existing or new development is to increase requirements for private and public BMP inspection and maintenance.

Implementation Plan - Page 8

“The available tools for estimating the benefits from load reduction actions within the stream channel erosion, atmospheric deposition, and forest upland are less advanced than the established methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness.”

With all the efforts to protect or restore salmonid fisheries in the forested Northwest, is this true? The methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness are still being debated, and additional data on BMP performance is needed (e.g. see Final Lake Tahoe TMDL Report pgs 12-5, 13-2) Are the tools for assessing pollutant reduction measure effectiveness in forested lands really less advanced?

Comment

produce 63% of TN loads are only required to reduce loads by 2% by year 65 and Forest Uplands, also responsible for 18% of TN loading, are not required to reduce any TN loads. Though we recognize that Lahontan staff has referred to the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (2008) and other TMDL reports in responding to questions on how the load reductions were allocated to pollutant sources, additional efforts to consider load reductions from forested uplands and atmospheric sources should be evaluated.

For example, in discussing the Characterization of Emission Sources in the Atmospheric Sources Section 2 (page 37) of the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (PRO report), the dominant source of resuspended dust from bare and disturbed surfaces in the Basin is identified as construction, and windblown dust from logging is considered to be negligible. Therefore, the PRO report addressed only the atmospheric dust load-reduction potential for control measures for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with construction sites, and did not appear to adequately address opportunities to reduce similar loads coming from disturbed areas within forested lands.

In the current economic conditions there is relatively little construction activity in the Tahoe Basin. After the 2007 Angora Fire, there has been an increased emphasis on the legitimate need for substantial fuels reduction in the basin. There are, and are likely to continue to be, significant soil disturbance associated with fuels reduction activities in forested areas. A comparison of the acreage of urban lands under construction to the acreage of fuels reduction treatment would be useful. Control measures should be considered for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with fuel reduction activities in forested uplands, particularly those adjacent to urbanized areas, roads and surface waters. These control measures could be similar to measures that would be used to reduce atmospheric dust associated with construction projects. Larger load reduction milestones should be considered for forested uplands and/or atmospheric sources.

Margin of Safety and Future Growth Potential – Page 8

This section notes that future build-out of all developable vacant private lots under existing regulations would only increase FSP loads by 2%. Please clarify whether the Lake Tahoe Watershed Model assumes that BMPs installed on newly developed parcels would be adequately maintained to prevent additional pollutant loads. One of the strategies to reduce urban upland pollutant loads from existing or new development is to increase requirements for private and public BMP inspection and maintenance.

Implementation Plan - Page 8

“The available tools for estimating the benefits from load reduction actions within the stream channel erosion, atmospheric deposition, and forest upland are less advanced than the established methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness.”

With all the efforts to protect or restore salmonid fisheries in the forested Northwest, is this true? The methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness are still being debated, and additional data on BMP performance is needed (e.g. see Final Lake Tahoe TMDL Report pgs 12-5, 13-2) Are the tools for assessing pollutant reduction measure effectiveness in forested lands really less advanced?

Response

CSLT-4: The Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (PRO Report) and the Lake Tahoe TMDL Report identify dust from paved and unpaved roadways as a major source of particles discharged to the lake by atmospheric deposition (see PRO Report pages 36-37). The analysis also identified specific pollutant control options for reducing dust from paved and unpaved roads, along with measures to reduce dust from construction sites and other disturbed surfaces (see PRO Report pages 40-42).

Dust control measures for lands disturbed by forest management practices are similar to measures taken to reduce dust from large scale construction activities. Such practices include regular watering of disturbed soil, chemical dust suppressants, mulch application, and limiting site disturbance (see PRO Report page 43).

The Lake Tahoe TMDL does not propose “larger load reduction milestones” for forested activities. Text has been added to the TMDL Implementation Plan section of the proposed Basin Plan amendment that requires entities conducting forest fuel reduction activities to include appropriate best management practices and appropriate monitoring to ensure fuels reduction actions do not increase fine sediment particle and nutrient loads. Entities conducting these projects must comply with any applicable state or federal permits regulating stormwater discharges from roads created for silvicultural activities. If future research and monitoring information indicates such adjustment is needed, the Water Board may choose to amend the pollutant load allocations to reflect new information.

CSLT-5: The proposed Basin Plan amendment documents included revised Margin of Safety and Future Growth Potential sections. The worst-case scenario build-out analysis concluded that development of all available private parcels to the maximum extent allowable by current development regulations would increase basin-wide fine sediment particle loading up to about two percent. The analysis assumes that new development will implement best management practices to infiltrate the required 20 year, 1-hour design storm. The analysis did assume that BMPs would be maintained. For more details regarding the future growth potential analysis, please see the *Tahoe land-use change model summary report and Climate Change literature review and Tahoe Basin projections*. (Halsing 2006)

The City is correct that “One of the strategies to reduce urban upland pollutant loads from existing or new development is to increase requirements for private and public BBMP inspection and maintenance.” The Water Board encourages the City to include such actions and requirements in its Pollutant Load Reduction Plan if the city believes such actions will assist it in achieving pollutant load reduction requirements. The City will need to adopt, implement, and enforce such requirements to ensure pollutant load reductions are achieved.

produce 63% of TN loads are only required to reduce loads by 2% by year 65 and Forest Uplands, also responsible for 18% of TN loading, are not required to reduce any TN loads. Though we recognize that Lahontan staff has referred to the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (2008) and other TMDL reports in responding to questions on how the load reductions were allocated to pollutant sources, additional efforts to consider load reductions from forested uplands and atmospheric sources should be evaluated.

For example, in discussing the Characterization of Emission Sources in the Atmospheric Sources Section 2 (page 37) of the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (PRO report), the dominant source of resuspended dust from bare and disturbed surfaces in the Basin is identified as construction, and windblown dust from logging is considered to be negligible. Therefore, the PRO report addressed only the atmospheric dust load-reduction potential for control measures for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with construction sites, and did not appear to adequately address opportunities to reduce similar loads coming from disturbed areas within forested lands.

In the current economic conditions there is relatively little construction activity in the Tahoe Basin. After the 2007 Angora Fire, there has been an increased emphasis on the legitimate need for substantial fuels reduction in the basin. There are, and are likely to continue to be, significant soil disturbance associated with fuels reduction activities in forested areas. A comparison of the acreage of urban lands under construction to the acreage of fuels reduction treatment would be useful. Control measures should be considered for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with fuel reduction activities in forested uplands, particularly those adjacent to urbanized areas, roads and surface waters. These control measures could be similar to measures that would be used to reduce atmospheric dust associated with construction projects. Larger load reduction milestones should be considered for forested uplands and/or atmospheric sources.

Margin of Safety and Future Growth Potential – Page 8

This section notes that future build-out of all developable vacant private lots under existing regulations would only increase FSP loads by 2%. Please clarify whether the Lake Tahoe Watershed Model assumes that BMPs installed on newly developed parcels would be adequately maintained to prevent additional pollutant loads. One of the strategies to reduce urban upland pollutant loads from existing or new development is to increase requirements for private and public BMP inspection and maintenance.

Implementation Plan - Page 8

“The available tools for estimating the benefits from load reduction actions within the stream channel erosion, atmospheric deposition, and forest upland are less advanced than the established methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness.”

With all the efforts to protect or restore salmonid fisheries in the forested Northwest, is this true? The methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness are still being debated, and additional data on BMP performance is needed (e.g. see Final Lake Tahoe TMDL Report pgs 12-5, 13-2) Are the tools for assessing pollutant reduction measure effectiveness in forested lands really less advanced?

Comment

produce 63% of TN loads are only required to reduce loads by 2% by year 65 and Forest Uplands, also responsible for 18% of TN loading, are not required to reduce any TN loads. Though we recognize that Lahontan staff has referred to the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (2008) and other TMDL reports in responding to questions on how the load reductions were allocated to pollutant sources, additional efforts to consider load reductions from forested uplands and atmospheric sources should be evaluated.

For example, in discussing the Characterization of Emission Sources in the Atmospheric Sources Section 2 (page 37) of the Lake Tahoe TMDL Pollutant Reduction Opportunity Report (PRO report), the dominant source of resuspended dust from bare and disturbed surfaces in the Basin is identified as construction, and windblown dust from logging is considered to be negligible. Therefore, the PRO report addressed only the atmospheric dust load-reduction potential for control measures for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with construction sites, and did not appear to adequately address opportunities to reduce similar loads coming from disturbed areas within forested lands.

In the current economic conditions there is relatively little construction activity in the Tahoe Basin. After the 2007 Angora Fire, there has been an increased emphasis on the legitimate need for substantial fuels reduction in the basin. There are, and are likely to continue to be, significant soil disturbance associated with fuels reduction activities in forested areas. A comparison of the acreage of urban lands under construction to the acreage of fuels reduction treatment would be useful. Control measures should be considered for bare, disturbed surfaces associated with fuel reduction activities in forested uplands, particularly those adjacent to urbanized areas, roads and surface waters. These control measures could be similar to measures that would be used to reduce atmospheric dust associated with construction projects. Larger load reduction milestones should be considered for forested uplands and/or atmospheric sources.

Margin of Safety and Future Growth Potential – Page 8

This section notes that future build-out of all developable vacant private lots under existing regulations would only increase FSP loads by 2%. Please clarify whether the Lake Tahoe Watershed Model assumes that BMPs installed on newly developed parcels would be adequately maintained to prevent additional pollutant loads. One of the strategies to reduce urban upland pollutant loads from existing or new development is to increase requirements for private and public BMP inspection and maintenance.

Implementation Plan - Page 8

“The available tools for estimating the benefits from load reduction actions within the stream channel erosion, atmospheric deposition, and forest upland are less advanced than the established methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness.”

With all the efforts to protect or restore salmonid fisheries in the forested Northwest, is this true? The methods to estimate urban upland control measure effectiveness are still being debated, and additional data on BMP performance is needed (e.g. see Final Lake Tahoe TMDL Report pgs 12-5, 13-2) Are the tools for assessing pollutant reduction measure effectiveness in forested lands really less advanced?

Response

CSLT-6: Given the TMDL source analysis showed that pollutant loading from urban areas was most significant, the tools that were developed for use in the Tahoe basin focus on this critical source. While there may be other locations and other TMDLs in the country that have chosen to focus on sources such as stream channel erosion, forest upland and even atmospheric deposition, any decision to do that would have most likely been done with respect to the dominant and controllable pollutant loads.

Additionally, sediment TMDLs developed for the north coast of California and other areas have focused on total suspended sediment, not fine sediment particles less than 16 micrometers in diameter. Because the fate and transport of fine sediment particles is much different than the processes driving total suspended sediment, the analysis tools developed for the north coast and other areas do not directly translate to use in the Lake Tahoe basin.

BMP effectiveness monitoring for forest uplands and atmospheric deposition are challenging. Since forest restoration projects are not done in areas of impervious soils, the hydrology or flow of runoff from the site to a tributary is often complicated by sub-surface runoff of unknown boundaries. Depending on the size of a project and its effect, there is often considerable dilution before stormwater runoff reaches a tributary suitable for sampling. The USFS – LTBMU and the research community has been considering the impacts of forest management practices on both project site runoff and downstream loading. Until this work comes to fruition, tools for assessing pollutant reduction effectiveness in forested lands will be less advanced than the tools that have been developed for the urban areas. However, the TMDL recognizes this condition and supports an open adaptive management process whereby newly developed tools and/or scientific information can be incorporated in the TMDL management system.

Urban Runoff - Page 9

City staff are disappointed that the basin-wide baseline load estimates were not scaled down to jurisdiction-scale baseline load estimates. The City had anticipated that task would be completed by the regulatory agencies prior to adopting BPA or MS4 permits. Jurisdictions now may use different baseline load calculation methods. We are not sure that using *standardized baseline condition values ... consistent with those used to estimate the 2003/2004 basin-wide pollutant loads* is sufficient to ensure that the estimated jurisdictional baselines will be comparable. Use of the Pollutant Load Reduction Model to estimate pollutant load reductions for projects will help identify worthy projects competing for grant dollars. However, without comparable baseline load calculations, it may be more difficult to allocate financial support (i.e. grants for water quality projects) among the jurisdictions in a manner that would provide the greatest potential load reduction.

The Lake Clarity Crediting Program is *intended to be incorporated into the NPDES permits*, providing tools for estimating pollutant load reductions and calculating jurisdiction-scale baseline loads. Are other methods acceptable? While the Water Board need to be cautious about specifying methods of compliance, more information on what types of other methods or tools for estimating pollutant load reductions or calculating jurisdictions-scale baseline loads should be provided to MS4 permittees during the BP amendment process.

Page 10 - Atmospheric Deposition

Atmospheric deposition contributes roughly half of the nitrogen and approximately 15 percent of the fine sediment particle load that reaches the lake... The majority of fine sediment particle load is generated by urban roadways... the required atmospheric load reductions will be met by implementing regulatory measures in stormwater NPDES permits to control stormwater pollutants from urban roadways under the urban upland source category. Will these stormwater (MS4) permits require jurisdictions to estimate and verify reductions in FSP loads associated with atmospheric deposition? With much more fuels reduction activities planned in forested uplands, would atmospheric deposition related to FSP associated with disturbed soils in fuels reduction projects and vegetation management areas continue to be insignificant? The BP amendments should discuss measures to reduce atmospheric deposition of pollutants generated in forested uplands, particularly from management projects near the urban uplands, roadways, and surface waters.

Page 10-11 Future Needs:

Future research needs are identified related to stream restoration and vegetation management. These studies are needed to quantify the benefits of pollutant load reduction programs outside of the urban uplands, and, if necessary, adjust the allocation of pollutant load reductions among the source categories. Will these studies be funded by the regulatory agencies and land management agencies or is significant funding for this research also expected from the MS4 jurisdictions? The MS4 permittees will face our own challenges in funding research and monitoring for activities in the urban uplands.

Comment

Urban Runoff - Page 9

City staff are disappointed that the basin-wide baseline load estimates were not scaled down to jurisdiction-scale baseline load estimates. The City had anticipated that task would be completed by the regulatory agencies prior to adopting BPA or MS4 permits. Jurisdictions now may use different baseline load calculation methods. We are not sure that using *standardized baseline condition values ... consistent with those used to estimate the 2003/2004 basin-wide pollutant loads* is sufficient to ensure that the estimated jurisdictional baselines will be comparable. Use of the Pollutant Load Reduction Model to estimate pollutant load reductions for projects will help identify worthy projects competing for grant dollars. However, without comparable baseline load calculations, it may be more difficult to allocate financial support (i.e. grants for water quality projects) among the jurisdictions in a manner that would provide the greatest potential load reduction.

The Lake Clarity Crediting Program is *intended to be incorporated into the NPDES permits*, providing tools for estimating pollutant load reductions and calculating jurisdiction-scale baseline loads. Are other methods acceptable? While the Water Board need to be cautious about specifying methods of compliance, more information on what types of other methods or tools for estimating pollutant load reductions or calculating jurisdictions-scale baseline loads should be provided to MS4 permittees during the BP amendment process.

Page 10 - Atmospheric Deposition

Atmospheric deposition contributes roughly half of the nitrogen and approximately 15 percent of the fine sediment particle load that reaches the lake... The majority of fine sediment particle load is generated by urban roadways... the required atmospheric load reductions will be met by implementing regulatory measures in stormwater NPDES permits to control stormwater pollutants from urban roadways under the urban upland source category. Will these stormwater (MS4) permits require jurisdictions to estimate and verify reductions in FSP loads associated with atmospheric deposition? With much more fuels reduction activities planned in forested uplands, would atmospheric deposition related to FSP associated with disturbed soils in fuels reduction projects and vegetation management areas continue to be insignificant? The BP amendments should discuss measures to reduce atmospheric deposition of pollutants generated in forested uplands, particularly from management projects near the urban uplands, roadways, and surface waters.

Page 10-11 Future Needs:

Future research needs are identified related to stream restoration and vegetation management. These studies are needed to quantify the benefits of pollutant load reduction programs outside of the urban uplands, and, if necessary, adjust the allocation of pollutant load reductions among the source categories. Will these studies be funded by the regulatory agencies and land management agencies or is significant funding for this research also expected from the MS4 jurisdictions? The MS4 permittees will face our own challenges in funding research and monitoring for activities in the urban uplands.

Response

CSLT-7: As described in the proposed Basin Plan amendment (see urban uplands implementation), the Water Board will provide clear guidance and requirements for calculating jurisdiction-specific baseline pollutant load estimates. The Pollutant Load Reduction Model is the preferred tool, but if a municipality can demonstrate alternative estimation approaches that provide results similar to and consistent with those generated by the Pollutant Load Reduction Model, than the Water Board will consider accepting the alternative estimation approach.

CSLT-8: The Lake Clarity Crediting Program is expected to be included in the monitoring and reporting portion of the upcoming revised NPDES municipal stormwater permit. There are no other known methods to link management actions to expected fine sediment particle load reductions. The estimation and condition verification tools referenced in the Lake Clarity Crediting Program Handbook are still in development. Although municipalities may propose alternative estimation and condition verification tools, they must first demonstrate the proposed alternative methods provide repeatable, and defensible results that are consistent with the Pollutant Load Reduction Model and the Best Management Practices Rapid Assessment Methodology and the Roadway Rapid Assessment Methodology.

CSLT-9: Municipal jurisdictions will not be required to estimate and verify fine sediment particle loads associated with atmospheric deposition. The proposed Basin Plan Amendment has been edited to clarify this point.

Urban Runoff - Page 9

City staff are disappointed that the basin-wide baseline load estimates were not scaled down to jurisdiction-scale baseline load estimates. The City had anticipated that task would be completed by the regulatory agencies prior to adopting BPA or MS4 permits. Jurisdictions now may use different baseline load calculation methods. We are not sure that using *standardized baseline condition values ... consistent with those used to estimate the 2003/2004 basin-wide pollutant loads* is sufficient to ensure that the estimated jurisdictional baselines will be comparable. Use of the Pollutant Load Reduction Model to estimate pollutant load reductions for projects will help identify worthy projects competing for grant dollars. However, without comparable baseline load calculations, it may be more difficult to allocate financial support (i.e. grants for water quality projects) among the jurisdictions in a manner that would provide the greatest potential load reduction.

The Lake Clarity Crediting Program is *intended to be incorporated into the NPDES permits*, providing tools for estimating pollutant load reductions and calculating jurisdiction-scale baseline loads. Are other methods acceptable? While the Water Board need to be cautious about specifying methods of compliance, more information on what types of other methods or tools for estimating pollutant load reductions or calculating jurisdictions-scale baseline loads should be provided to MS4 permittees during the BP amendment process.

Page 10 - Atmospheric Deposition

Atmospheric deposition contributes roughly half of the nitrogen and approximately 15 percent of the fine sediment particle load that reaches the lake... The majority of fine sediment particle load is generated by urban roadways... the required atmospheric load reductions will be met by implementing regulatory measures in stormwater NPDES permits to control stormwater pollutants from urban roadways under the urban upland source category. Will these stormwater (MS4) permits require jurisdictions to estimate and verify reductions in FSP loads associated with atmospheric deposition? With much more fuels reduction activities planned in forested uplands, would atmospheric deposition related to FSP associated with disturbed soils in fuels reduction projects and vegetation management areas continue to be insignificant? The BP amendments should discuss measures to reduce atmospheric deposition of pollutants generated in forested uplands, particularly from management projects near the urban uplands, roadways, and surface waters.

Page 10-11 Future Needs:

Future research needs are identified related to stream restoration and vegetation management. These studies are needed to quantify the benefits of pollutant load reduction programs outside of the urban uplands, and, if necessary, adjust the allocation of pollutant load reductions among the source categories. Will these studies be funded by the regulatory agencies and land management agencies or is significant funding for this research also expected from the MS4 jurisdictions? The MS4 permittees will face our own challenges in funding research and monitoring for activities in the urban uplands.

Comment

Urban Runoff - Page 9

City staff are disappointed that the basin-wide baseline load estimates were not scaled down to jurisdiction-scale baseline load estimates. The City had anticipated that task would be completed by the regulatory agencies prior to adopting BPA or MS4 permits. Jurisdictions now may use different baseline load calculation methods. We are not sure that using *standardized baseline condition values ... consistent with those used to estimate the 2003/2004 basin-wide pollutant loads* is sufficient to ensure that the estimated jurisdictional baselines will be comparable. Use of the Pollutant Load Reduction Model to estimate pollutant load reductions for projects will help identify worthy projects competing for grant dollars. However, without comparable baseline load calculations, it may be more difficult to allocate financial support (i.e. grants for water quality projects) among the jurisdictions in a manner that would provide the greatest potential load reduction.

The Lake Clarity Crediting Program is *intended to be incorporated into the NPDES permits*, providing tools for estimating pollutant load reductions and calculating jurisdiction-scale baseline loads. Are other methods acceptable? While the Water Board need to be cautious about specifying methods of compliance, more information on what types of other methods or tools for estimating pollutant load reductions or calculating jurisdictions-scale baseline loads should be provided to MS4 permittees during the BP amendment process.

Page 10 - Atmospheric Deposition

Atmospheric deposition contributes roughly half of the nitrogen and approximately 15 percent of the fine sediment particle load that reaches the lake... The majority of fine sediment particle load is generated by urban roadways... the required atmospheric load reductions will be met by implementing regulatory measures in stormwater NPDES permits to control stormwater pollutants from urban roadways under the urban upland source category. Will these stormwater (MS4) permits require jurisdictions to estimate and verify reductions in FSP loads associated with atmospheric deposition? With much more fuels reduction activities planned in forested uplands, would atmospheric deposition related to FSP associated with disturbed soils in fuels reduction projects and vegetation management areas continue to be insignificant? The BP amendments should discuss measures to reduce atmospheric deposition of pollutants generated in forested uplands, particularly from management projects near the urban uplands, roadways, and surface waters.

Page 10-11 Future Needs:

Future research needs are identified related to stream restoration and vegetation management. These studies are needed to quantify the benefits of pollutant load reduction programs outside of the urban uplands, and, if necessary, adjust the allocation of pollutant load reductions among the source categories. Will these studies be funded by the regulatory agencies and land management agencies or is significant funding for this research also expected from the MS4 jurisdictions? The MS4 permittees will face our own challenges in funding research and monitoring for activities in the urban uplands.

Response

CSLT-10: It is unknown whether vegetation management actions will influence atmospheric deposition loading rates. Due to the difficulty in assessing the sources of dust in the local atmosphere, the Lake Tahoe TMDL does not describe relative magnitude of sources, thus the dust associated with forest management actions has not been deemed "insignificant" by any measure.

The implementation measures to reduce dust sources described in the proposed Basin Plan amendment apply to all dust-generating actions, including forest management projects near urban areas, roadways, and surface waters. According to the *SCIC Draft Load Reduction Matrix Analysis Report for Atmospheric Deposition of Pollutants into Lake Tahoe* (produced for the TMDL program and dated May 2, 2007), the major sources of fugitive dust are resuspended road dust from vehicles traveling on paved and unpaved roads and dust generated by construction and demolition activities.

The estimates contained in that report for the annual fugitive dust emission inventory for the Basin are as follows: unpaved roads 47.6 percent, paved roads 44.1 percent, building construction 5.3 percent, paved road construction 2.5 percent and other 0.5 percent. There was insufficient data to estimate background dust generation from forested land not associated with unpaved roads.

Municipalities will not be required to evaluate and report atmospheric load reduction measures as part of its municipal NPDES stormwater permit requirements.

CSLT-11: Historically, the type of research and monitoring referenced in the comment has been funded by federal and state sources. For example, there are current studies underway, funded by the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act, to evaluate the load reduction potential associated with over-bank stream flows. Other work, funded by federal and state sources, is assessing the potential impact of various vegetation management techniques. Unless a municipality wishes to pursue Lake Clarity Credits for stream restoration activities by demonstrating such restoration effectively treats urban runoff, there is no expectation that local government will contribute to research and monitoring of stream channel and forest upland load and load reduction efforts.

Page 11. Table 5.18-5 Urban Upland Implementation/Reporting Schedule

Several actions are scheduled for *no later than two years after TMDL approval (EPA approval)*. Will the requirements to meet the schedule be specified in the MS4 permit, or would the schedule in the BPA itself be expose the MS4 permittees to enforcement actions (e.g. for violating provisions, such as schedules now in the Basin Plan)? We had understood that the updated MS4 permit would be the main regulatory tool for assessing compliance. We've recently heard from Lahontan Water Board staff that the updated MS4 permit and EPA approval most likely would now occur no earlier than fall 2011. Would this alter the schedule in Table 5.18-5? Please discuss other likely actions the Lahontan Water Board is considering to encourage or require early implementation of the requirements of LTTMDL for MS4 permittees prior to updates to the MS4 permit, e.g. modifications to Monitoring and Reporting Program required under the existing MS4 permit. This information is needed for jurisdictions to plan and budget for actions required to maintain compliance with Lahontan Water Board requirements.

Page 12 – Monitoring Plan

Regional Board expects the monitoring plan components to be fully developed by agency stakeholders within the first two years following TMDL adoption by USEPA, and full monitoring program operation is expected by the third year. Are these agency stakeholders primarily the regulatory agencies with some input from scientists, and funding and implementing agencies? City staff had hoped that the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program (RSWMP) would be in operation prior to adoption of new MS4 permits, but development of RSWMP has been slow.

The source monitoring will focus on the largest source, urban uplands. While sampling runoff and measuring relationships between flows and precipitation is desirable, will monitoring be required by BPA or MS4 permit prior to two years after EPA approval. Prior to conducting water quality sampling, City staff want to make sure that monitoring is done in a way that produces useful results. Are the regulatory agencies comfortable with using modeled pollutant load reductions as a substitute for actual water quality monitoring until the monitoring plan components are developed. Is the anticipated cost (basin-wide) for the monitoring program called for in the BP amendments still estimated to be \$1.2 m/y? This information is also needed to plan and budget for actions need to maintain compliance.

B. Proposed Changes to Existing Basin Plan Language.

General Comments on changes to existing Basin Plan text.

Are these proposed changes to existing BP language all considered part of the Lake Tahoe TMDL (to be approved by OAL and EPA), or can some or all of these changes take effect prior to OAL EPA approval?

Specific Comments

Page 14 – pg 4.3-3 column 1, pgph. 5 - Use of Wetlands for Stormwater Treatment

City staff supports use of SEZs for removal of FSP and nutrients. Does TRPA support this approach, i.e., if TRPA requires treatment to their numerical effluent limits before discharge to SEZs or wet treatment basins, implementing agencies will not be inclined to use

Comment

Page 11. Table 5.18-5 Urban Upland Implementation/Reporting Schedule

Several actions are scheduled for *no later than two years after TMDL approval* (EPA approval). Will the requirements to meet the schedule be specified in the MS4 permit, or would the schedule in the BPA itself be expose the MS4 permittees to enforcement actions (e.g. for violating provisions, such as schedules now in the Basin Plan)? We had understood that the updated MS4 permit would be the main regulatory tool for assessing compliance. We've recently heard from Lahontan Water Board staff that the updated MS4 permit and EPA approval most likely would now occur no earlier than fall 2011. Would this alter the schedule in Table 5.18-5? Please discuss other likely actions the Lahontan Water Board is considering to encourage or require early implementation of the requirements of LTTMDL for MS4 permittees prior to updates to the MS4 permit, e.g. modifications to Monitoring and Reporting Program required under the existing MS4 permit. This information is needed for jurisdictions to plan and budget for actions required to maintain compliance with Lahontan Water Board requirements.

Page 12 – Monitoring Plan

Regional Board expects the monitoring plan components to be fully developed by agency stakeholders within the first two years following TMDL adoption by USEPA, and full monitoring program operation is expected by the third year. Are these agency stakeholders primarily the regulatory agencies with some input from scientists, and funding and implementing agencies? City staff had hoped that the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program (RSWMP) would be in operation prior to adoption of new MS4 permits, but development of RSWMP has been slow.

The source monitoring will focus on the largest source, urban uplands. While sampling runoff and measuring relationships between flows and precipitation is desirable, will monitoring be required by BPA or MS4 permit prior to two years after EPA approval. Prior to conducting water quality sampling, City staff want to make sure that monitoring is done in a way that produces useful results. Are the regulatory agencies comfortable with using modeled pollutant load reductions as a substitute for actual water quality monitoring until the monitoring plan components are developed. Is the anticipated cost (basin-wide) for the monitoring program called for in the BP amendments still estimated to be \$1.2 m/y? This information is also needed to plan and budget for actions need to maintain compliance.

B. Proposed Changes to Existing Basin Plan Language.

General Comments on changes to existing Basin Plan text.

Are these proposed changes to existing BP language all considered part of the Lake Tahoe TMDL (to be approved by OAL and EPA), or can some or all of these changes take effect prior to OAL EPA approval?

Specific Comments

Page 14 – pg 4.3-3 column 1, pgph. 5 - Use of Wetlands for Stormwater Treatment

City staff supports use of SEZs for removal of FSP and nutrients. Does TRPA support this approach, i.e., if TRPA requires treatment to their numerical effluent limits before discharge to SEZs or wet treatment basins, implementing agencies will not be inclined to use

Response

CSLT-12: The proposed language states that these actions shall be taken *no later than* two years after TMDL approval, which is the date that US EPA approves the TMDL. The following language has been added to the proposed Basin Plan Amendment schedule:

“These due dates are not imposed by virtue of the Basin Plan. The due dates will be established in Regional Board orders consistent with the schedule noted herein.”

CSLT-13: The anticipated timing of the updated Municipal NPDES stormwater permit will not change the implementation schedule.

CSLT-14: The proposed language states that these actions shall be taken *no later than* (emphasis added) two years after TMDL approval, which is the date that US EPA approves the TMDL. However, it is more likely that the Water Board Executive Officer will require the baseline load analysis and initial load reduction plans be developed on a shorter schedule. Also, all actions taken since 2004 may count toward the required load reductions, regardless if they are taken prior to EPA final approval of the TMDL. By not postponing implementation until after EPA approval, municipalities will be better situated to achieve the required load reductions.

CSLT-15: The Monitoring Plan portion of the proposed Basin Plan Amendment has been edited to better describe the expected monitoring actions for each source. The urban uplands monitoring section provides a detailed description of the Regional Storm Water Monitoring Program (RSWMP) and the agencies involved. The RSWMP Core Working Group includes representatives from implementation, regulatory, and funding agencies. The Water Board anticipates the RSWMP will be sufficiently developed by fall 2011 for inclusion in the Municipal NPDES stormwater permit update.

CSLT-16: The proposed Basin Plan Amendment does not establish monitoring requirements. Specific monitoring requirements will be included in the updated Municipal NPDES stormwater permits.

Page 11. Table 5.18-5 Urban Upland Implementation/Reporting Schedule

Several actions are scheduled for *no later than two years after TMDL approval (EPA approval)*. Will the requirements to meet the schedule be specified in the MS4 permit, or would the schedule in the BPA itself be expose the MS4 permittees to enforcement actions (e.g. for violating provisions, such as schedules now in the Basin Plan)? We had understood that the updated MS4 permit would be the main regulatory tool for assessing compliance. We've recently heard from Lahontan Water Board staff that the updated MS4 permit and EPA approval most likely would now occur no earlier than fall 2011. Would this alter the schedule in Table 5.18-5? Please discuss other likely actions the Lahontan Water Board is considering to encourage or require early implementation of the requirements of LTTMDL for MS4 permittees prior to updates to the MS4 permit, e.g. modifications to Monitoring and Reporting Program required under the existing MS4 permit. This information is needed for jurisdictions to plan and budget for actions required to maintain compliance with Lahontan Water Board requirements.

Page 12 – Monitoring Plan

Regional Board expects the monitoring plan components to be fully developed by agency stakeholders within the first two years following TMDL adoption by USEPA, and full monitoring program operation is expected by the third year. Are these agency stakeholders primarily the regulatory agencies with some input from scientists, and funding and implementing agencies? City staff had hoped that the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program (RSWMP) would be in operation prior to adoption of new MS4 permits, but development of RSWMP has been slow.

The source monitoring will focus on the largest source, urban uplands. While sampling runoff and measuring relationships between flows and precipitation is desirable, will monitoring be required by BPA or MS4 permit prior to two years after EPA approval. Prior to conducting water quality sampling, City staff want to make sure that monitoring is done in a way that produces useful results. Are the regulatory agencies comfortable with using modeled pollutant load reductions as a substitute for actual water quality monitoring until the monitoring plan components are developed. Is the anticipated cost (basin-wide) for the monitoring program called for in the BP amendments still estimated to be \$1.2 m/y? This information is also needed to plan and budget for actions need to maintain compliance.

B. Proposed Changes to Existing Basin Plan Language.

General Comments on changes to existing Basin Plan text.

Are these proposed changes to existing BP language all considered part of the Lake Tahoe TMDL (to be approved by OAL and EPA), or can some or all of these changes take effect prior to OAL EPA approval?

Specific Comments

Page 14 – pg 4.3-3 column 1, pgph. 5 - Use of Wetlands for Stormwater Treatment

City staff supports use of SEZs for removal of FSP and nutrients. Does TRPA support this approach, i.e., if TRPA requires treatment to their numerical effluent limits before discharge to SEZs or wet treatment basins, implementing agencies will not be inclined to use

Comment

Page 11. Table 5.18-5 Urban Upland Implementation/Reporting Schedule

Several actions are scheduled for no later than two years after TMDL approval (EPA approval). Will the requirements to meet the schedule be specified in the MS4 permit, or would the schedule in the BPA itself be expose the MS4 permittees to enforcement actions (e.g. for violating provisions, such as schedules now in the Basin Plan)? We had understood that the updated MS4 permit would be the main regulatory tool for assessing compliance. We've recently heard from Lahontan Water Board staff that the updated MS4 permit and EPA approval most likely would now occur no earlier than fall 2011. Would this alter the schedule in Table 5.18-5? Please discuss other likely actions the Lahontan Water Board is considering to encourage or require early implementation of the requirements of LTTMDL for MS4 permittees prior to updates to the MS4 permit, e.g. modifications to Monitoring and Reporting Program required under the existing MS4 permit. This information is needed for jurisdictions to plan and budget for actions required to maintain compliance with Lahontan Water Board requirements.

Page 12 – Monitoring Plan

Regional Board expects the monitoring plan components to be fully developed by agency stakeholders within the first two years following TMDL adoption by USEPA, and full monitoring program operation is expected by the third year. Are these agency stakeholders primarily the regulatory agencies with some input from scientists, and funding and implementing agencies? City staff had hoped that the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program (RSWMP) would be in operation prior to adoption of new MS4 permits, but development of RSWMP has been slow.

The source monitoring will focus on the largest source, urban uplands. While sampling runoff and measuring relationships between flows and precipitation is desirable, will monitoring be required by BPA or MS4 permit prior to two years after EPA approval. Prior to conducting water quality sampling, City staff want to make sure that monitoring is done in a way that produces useful results. Are the regulatory agencies comfortable with using modeled pollutant load reductions as a substitute for actual water quality monitoring until the monitoring plan components are developed. Is the anticipated cost (basin-wide) for the monitoring program called for in the BP amendments still estimated to be \$1.2 m/y? This information is also needed to plan and budget for actions need to maintain compliance.

B. Proposed Changes to Existing Basin Plan Language.

General Comments on changes to existing Basin Plan text.

Are these proposed changes to existing BP language all considered part of the Lake Tahoe TMDL (to be approved by OAL and EPA), or can some or all of these changes take effect prior to OAL EPA approval?

Specific Comments

Page 14 – pg 4.3-3 column 1, pgph. 5 - Use of Wetlands for Stormwater Treatment

City staff supports use of SEZs for removal of FSP and nutrients. Does TRPA support this approach, i.e., if TRPA requires treatment to their numerical effluent limits before discharge to SEZs or wet treatment basins, implementing agencies will not be inclined to use

Response

CSLT-17: Given the seasonal and inter-annual variability in stormwater runoff, modeled estimates are the most reliable method for evaluating average annual pollutant loads.

CSLT-18: Regional Storm Water Monitoring Program cost estimates are still in development. Program cost will depend on the number of sampling sites, number of samples, constituents analyzed, and a number of other variables. There is insufficient information about expecting monitoring costs to include in the proposed Basin Plan Amendment. The Water Board will work with local municipalities to balance stormwater monitoring needs with cost.

CSLT-19: The proposed Basin Plan Amendment includes the Lake Tahoe TMDL. The Basin Plan amendment process is the only mechanism by which the Water Board can adopt this TMDL. The proposed changes to the Basin Plan will not take effect until the US EPA approves the Lake Tahoe TMDL.

CSLT-20: The Water Board cannot speak for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency regarding this issue. However, as noted above, Water Board staff are working with the TRPA to address known regulatory inconsistencies, including the numeric effluent limits for discharges to wetland areas.

SEZ/wetland treatment. Describe status of efforts to ensure that TRPA's regulatory approach to use of wetlands and SEZs will be consistent with the LTTMDL.

Page 15 - pg 4.8-4 column 2, pgph. 3

City supports this change, which eliminates the requirement that all existing facilities be retrofitted for a 20-year 1-hour storm. New language eliminates the *all*, the expired 20-year time frame ending in 2008, and specifies only that facilities be retrofit consistent with guidelines for pollutant load reduction requirements. This approach will encourage catchment-scale projects or activities designed to maximize reduce pollutant loads, while not mandating that retrofit work is required on road segments that do not discharge FSP to surface waters or the Lake.

Page 17 (pg 5-2 column 1, pgph. 1)

*Development **and on-going soil-disturbing land use** practices which may have little impact elsewhere can cause severe erosion in the Tahoe Basin, increasing fine sediment particle, nitrogen and phosphorus ~~and nutrient~~ loads to Lake Tahoe. ~~Relatively small nutrient loadings can seriously affect Lake Tahoe's water quality.~~ The level of algal growth in the lake is limited by the availability of nutrients; the concentration of nutrients in the lake at present is extremely low. The primary source of additional ~~nutrients~~ phosphorus is erosion resulting from land development and land management practices. Lake Tahoe has historically been considered nitrogen limited. Recent bioassays indicate that phosphorus is also becoming limiting in some situations. ~~It is important to control all controllable sources of both nitrogen and phosphorus.~~ Development **and ongoing soil disturbances damage** vegetation and soils, and creates impervious surface coverage which interferes with natural nutrient and fine sediment particle removal mechanisms. **These areas of unprotected and impacted soils become sources for fine sediment particles.** Other sources of nutrients include fertilizers, sewer exfiltration and sewage spills, and leachate from abandoned septic systems, and atmospheric deposition.*

Fine sediment particles are independently responsible for approximately two thirds of the lake's deep water transparency loss. The mechanism for transparency loss from fine sediment particles is the scattering of light in the water column. This contrasts with transparency loss due to light absorption caused by enhanced phytoplankton productivity.

Additional text proposed. It is important to recognize that new development is not the major problem at Tahoe; source control involves protection of soils in already-developed areas. On-going soil disturbance from parking, off-road vehicles, snow removal activities, or landscaping practices that leave large bare soil areas exposed all contribute to erosion and increased pollutant loading. These disturbances may persist long after a parcel has been developed.

The concept that new development is a major problem leads to the erroneous idea that new development or redevelopment of a few areas could be significant in reducing urban pollutant loads. This Water Quality Problems and Control Needs section should identify the need for additional measures to stabilize and maintain protection for soils in areas that may

Comment

Response

SEZ/wetland treatment. Describe status of efforts to ensure that TRPA's regulatory approach to use of wetlands and SEZs will be consistent with the LTTMDL.

Page 15 - pg 4.8-4 column 2, pgph. 3

City supports this change, which eliminates the requirement that all existing facilities be retrofitted for a 20-year 1-hour storm. New language eliminates the *all*, the expired 20-year time frame ending in 2008, and specifies only that facilities be retrofit consistent with guidelines for pollutant load reduction requirements. This approach will encourage catchment-scale projects or activities designed to maximize reduce pollutant loads, while not mandating that retrofit work is required on road segments that do not discharge FSP to surface waters or the Lake.

Page 17 (pg 5-2 column 1, pgph. 1)

Development ~~and on-going soil-disturbing land use~~ practices which may have little impact elsewhere can cause severe erosion in the Tahoe Basin, increasing fine sediment particle, nitrogen and phosphorus and nutrient loads to Lake Tahoe. ~~Relatively small nutrient loadings can seriously affect Lake Tahoe's water quality.~~ The level of algal growth in the lake is limited by the availability of nutrients; the concentration of nutrients in the lake at present is extremely low. The primary source of additional ~~nutrients~~ phosphorus is erosion resulting from land development and land management practices. Lake Tahoe has historically been considered nitrogen limited. Recent bioassays indicate that phosphorus is also becoming limiting in some situations. ~~It is important to control all controllable sources of both nitrogen and phosphorus.~~ Development and ongoing soil ~~disturbances~~ damage vegetation and soils, and creates impervious surface coverage which interferes with natural nutrient and fine sediment particle removal mechanisms. These areas of unprotected and impacted soils become sources for fine sediment particles. Other sources of nutrients include fertilizers, sewer exfiltration and sewage spills, and leachate from abandoned septic systems, and atmospheric deposition.

Fine sediment particles are independently responsible for approximately two thirds of the lake's deep water transparency loss. The mechanism for transparency loss from fine sediment particles is the scattering of light in the water column. This contrasts with transparency loss due to light absorption caused by enhanced phytoplankton productivity.

Additional text proposed. It is important to recognize that new development is not the major problem at Tahoe; source control involves protection of soils in already-developed areas. On-going soil disturbance from parking, off-road vehicles, snow removal activities, or landscaping practices that leave large bare soil areas exposed all contribute to erosion and increased pollutant loading. These disturbances may persist long after a parcel has been developed.

The concept that new development is a major problem leads to the erroneous idea that new development or redevelopment of a few areas could be significant in reducing urban pollutant loads. This Water Quality Problems and Control Needs section should identify the need for additional measures to stabilize and maintain protection for soils in areas that may

CSLT-21: Water Board staff have incorporated the suggested changes into the proposed Basin Plan Amendment.

CSLT-22: Water Board staff have incorporated the suggested changes into the proposed Basin Plan Amendment.

have been developed many years ago. It may be useful to identify that older, densely developed and populated residential and commercial neighborhoods may be more significant pollutant sources than newer, less intense development.

Page 21 – pg 5-11, Table 5-1 – Stormwater Controls

Best Management Practices. Is it true that *Retrofits of BMPs required by Regional Board for existing development*? This may be true for the 1990s individual site WDRs, but please identify where this is a requirement in the BP. If retrofits are still required by the Regional Board, may not want to eliminate *Regional Board* from the paragraph at the top of Table 5-1.

Page 22 - pg 5.6-1 column 1, pgph 1 - Stormwater Controls

*Development **and continued soil disturbance after initial development** of the watershed has greatly accelerated natural erosion rates ...*

See previous comments for Page 17 (pg 5-2 column 1, pgph. 1)

Page 22-24 Replacement of section on effluent limitations

The City supports these changes which emphasize reducing annual loads and promoting infiltration at catchment-scale projects, rather than retaining a requirement to meet effluent limitations at all times at all locations.

Page 24 Stormwater Treatment Requirements – second paragraph

Pollutant concentrations and runoff volumes from non-roadway parcels differ greatly from commingled stormwater from roads and parcels. Provide evidence for this statement, e.g. why would runoff from a commercial non-roadway parcel have greatly different runoff volume and concentrations than runoff from a secondary road through a partly developed residential neighborhood with large lot size?

Third paragraph

*Municipal jurisdictions and state highway departments must meet load reduction requirements specified by the Lake Tahoe TMDL (Tables 5.18-2 – 5.18-4). These agencies **should must** consider a variety of different design storms, alternative treatment options, and roadway operations practices, and local ordinances to maximize average annual pollutant load reductions to meet waste load allocations.*

Change "must" to "should" in second sentence – must is appropriate for meeting load reduction requirements. Second sentence need not be mandatory – jurisdictions can determine which methods to use to comply with load reduction requirements

Fifth paragraph

For new development and re-development projects and ~~individual parcel Best Management Practice efforts retrofits to install Best Management Practices on private parcels~~, project proponents shall first consider every opportunity to

~~designed and constructed to~~ infiltrate runoff generated by the 20 year, 1-hour storm which equates to approximately one inch of runoff.

Comment

have been developed many years ago. It may be useful to identify that older, densely developed and populated residential and commercial neighborhoods may be more significant pollutant sources than newer, less intense development.

Page 21 – pg 5-11, Table 5-1 – Stormwater Controls

Best Management Practices. Is it true that *Retrofits of BMPs required by Regional Board for existing development*? This may be true for the 1990s individual site WDRs, but please identify where this is a requirement in the BP. If retrofits are still required by the Regional Board, may not want to eliminate *Regional Board* from the paragraph at the top of Table 5-1.

Page 22 - pg 5.6-1 column 1, pgph 1 - Stormwater Controls

Development **and continued soil disturbance after initial development** of the watershed has greatly accelerated natural erosion rates ...

See previous comments for Page 17 (pg 5-2 column 1, pgph. 1)

Page 22-24 Replacement of section on effluent limitations

The City supports these changes which emphasize reducing annual loads and promoting infiltration at catchment-scale projects, rather than retaining a requirement to meet effluent limitations at all times at all locations.

Page 24 Stormwater Treatment Requirements – second paragraph

Pollutant concentrations and runoff volumes from non-roadway parcels differ greatly from commingled stormwater from roads and parcels. Provide evidence for this statement, e.g. why would runoff from a commercial non-roadway parcel have greatly different runoff volume and concentrations than runoff from a secondary road through a partly developed residential neighborhood with large lot size?

Third paragraph

*Municipal jurisdictions and state highway departments must meet load reduction requirements specified by the Lake Tahoe TMDL (Tables 5.18-2 – 5.18-4). These agencies **should must** consider a variety of different design storms, alternative treatment options, and roadway operations practices, and local ordinances to maximize average annual pollutant load reductions to meet waste load allocations.*

Change “must” to “should” in second sentence – must is appropriate for meeting load reduction requirements. Second sentence need not be mandatory – jurisdictions can determine which methods to use to comply with load reduction requirements

Fifth paragraph

For new development and re-development projects and ~~individual parcel Best Management Practice efforts retrofits to install Best Management Practices on private parcels~~, project proponents shall first consider every opportunity to

~~designed and constructed to~~ infiltrate runoff generated by the 20 year, 1-hour storm which equates to approximately one inch of runoff.

Response

CSLT-23: The Water Board has the authority to impose Waste Discharge Requirements on any discharger, regardless of whether the Regional Board is listed in the referenced table. The proposed Basin Plan Amendment removes “Regional Board” from a portion of table title because it is redundant with other portions of the title and with references in the table itself.

CSLT-24: Water Board staff have incorporated the suggested changes into the proposed Basin Plan Amendment.

CSLT-25: The referenced sentence has been removed from the proposed Basin Plan Amendment.

CSLT-26: The stormwater treatment portion of the proposed Basin Plan Amendment has been edited. The referenced sentence now reads:

“These agencies *will likely* consider a variety of different design storms, alternative treatment options, and roadway operations practices, and local ordinances to reduce average annual pollutant loads from selected areas to meet waste load allocation requirements.” (emphasis added)

Changes proposed – to encourage private property owners to work together on multi-parcel BMPs, eliminate reference to individual parcel BMPs.

Top of Page 25

Text appears to be missing some words

Page 25 Third paragraph

In the event that site conditions do not provide opportunities to infiltrate the runoff volume generated by a 20 year, 1-hour storm, projects must meet the numeric effluent limits in Table 5.6-1. These limits shall apply to urban runoff discharges to surface waters for runoff volumes generated by a 20-year, 1-hour storm. These limits only apply to stormwater discharges that cannot be infiltrated and are not tributary to stormwater management facilities that are part of a municipality's plan to meet average annual fine sediment and nutrient load reduction requirements.

Pretreatment or treatment stormwater control measures generally are sized for flow rather than volume. Language proposes that limits apply to for the 1st inch of runoff, rather than for flows generated by runoff events up to 1 in/hour. While sizing flow-through treatment devices for the 1 in/hour storm flows would result in excessively high costs for large devices which would seldom see the design flows, it may be more appropriate to specify a design storm's flow rate rather than a volume. Unlike infiltration facilities, most treatment devices are designed for flow rates rather than volumes. For treatment devices whose effectiveness should be sized for flows rather than volumes, e.g. vaults or cartridge filters, consider allowing an option for flow-through treatment facilities to be designed to treat 0.5 inch/hour runoff events, which would treat a very high percentage of average annual runoff.

Treatment devices, regardless of size, may not be able to reliably guarantee that outflows would meet the numeric effluent limits (NELs). Dischargers violating the NELs would apparently be subject to mandatory minimum penalties (MMPs) if the discharges were not tributary to part of the municipality's registered catchments. Would MMPs apply to retrofit projects, as well as parcels w/o BMPs? Who would the Water Board target enforcement action for the MMP NEL violation; parcel owner or municipality? Need to clarify expectations and responsibilities.

Last sentence allows discharge to surface waters to exceed NELs if there are downstream municipal stormwater management facilities that are part of the municipality's load reduction plans. City supports this approach. We do want clarification as to whether this applies only to areas where catchments are registered in the Lake Clarity Crediting Program (LCCP), or also to any areas where the municipality has stormwater management facilities.

Page 26 – pg 5-7-13 - 2nd line

*Future development **or continued soil disturbance in already developed areas** will increase nutrient transport in ground water by removing vegetation which normally recycles nutrients in the watershed.*

Comment

Response

Changes proposed – to encourage private property owners to work together on multi-parcel BMPs, eliminate reference to individual parcel BMPs.

CSLT-27: Water Board staff have incorporated the suggested changes into the proposed Basin Plan Amendment.

Top of Page 25

Text appears to be missing some words

Page 25 Third paragraph

In the event that site conditions do not provide opportunities to infiltrate the runoff volume generated by a 20 year, 1-hour storm, projects must meet the numeric effluent limits in Table 5.6-1. These limits shall apply to urban runoff discharges to surface waters for runoff volumes generated by a 20-year, 1-hour storm. These limits only apply to stormwater discharges that cannot be infiltrated and are not tributary to stormwater management facilities that are part of a municipality's plan to meet average annual fine sediment and nutrient load reduction requirements.

Pretreatment or treatment stormwater control measures generally are sized for flow rather than volume. Language proposes that limits apply to for the 1st inch of runoff, rather than for flows generated by runoff events up to 1 in/hour. While sizing flow-through treatment devices for the 1 in/hour storm flows would result in excessively high costs for large devices which would seldom see the design flows, it may be more appropriate to specify a design storm's flow rate rather than a volume. Unlike infiltration facilities, most treatment devices are designed for flow rates rather than volumes. For treatment devices whose effectiveness should be sized for flows rather than volumes, e.g. vaults or cartridge filters, consider allowing an option for flow-through treatment facilities to be designed to treat 0.5 inch/hour runoff events, which would treat a very high percentage of average annual runoff.

CSLT-28: The comment: "...sizing flow through treatment devices for the 1 in/hour storm flows would result in excessively high costs for large devices.." is speculative. Project proponents must consider site-specific alternatives to attenuate flows, store runoff, and otherwise treat the 20 year, 1-hour storm to meet specified effluent limits. There are a number of engineering techniques to consider the time of concentration and convert the volume-based design storm to a design flow rate.

Treatment devices, regardless of size, may not be able to reliably guarantee that outflows would meet the numeric effluent limits (NELs). Dischargers violating the NELs would apparently be subject to mandatory minimum penalties (MMPs) if the discharges were not tributary to part of the municipality's registered catchments. Would MMPs apply to retrofit projects, as well as parcels w/o BMPs? Who would the Water Board target enforcement action for the MMP NEL violation; parcel owner or municipality? Need to clarify expectations and responsibilities.

CSLT-29: Mandatory Minimum Penalties only apply when effluent limits contained in NPDES permits are violated. Although the effluent limits are expected to be included in NPDES construction stormwater permits, there are no plans to include numeric effluent limits for stormwater discharges in the updated Municipal NPDES stormwater permit.

Last sentence allows discharge to surface waters to exceed NELs if there are downstream municipal stormwater management facilities that are part of the municipality's load reduction plans. City supports this approach. We do want clarification as to whether this applies only to areas where catchments are registered in the Lake Clarity Crediting Program (LCCP), or also to any areas where the municipality has stormwater management facilities.

CSLT-30: Should the City choose to partner with a private property owner to provide shared stormwater treatment solutions, the City will need to register the catchment under the Lake Clarity Crediting Program to demonstrate the shared facilities reduce fine sediment particle and nutrient loads in a manner consistent with the City's Pollutant Load Reduction Plan.

Page 26 – pg 5-7-13 - 2nd line

*Future development **or continued soil disturbance in already developed areas** will increase nutrient transport in ground water by removing vegetation which normally recycles nutrients in the watershed.*

See previous comments

Page 26 - Table 5.7-5

Table shows highest concentrations of dissolved nitrogen in recreational land uses. Text on pages 25- 26 on ground water protection and impacts of urbanization doesn't specifically mention recreational land uses. Consider adding a sentence discussing control measures for reducing nitrate concentrations or loads associated with recreational areas, e.g., fertilizer controls, etc.

Page 27 – pg 5.12-2

The revised BMP for street sweeping discusses the efficiency of different types of sweepers and requires sweeping at least once a year. Street sweeping with high efficiency (PM_{2.5}) sweepers removes many fine sediment particles that could be potentially entrained in urban runoff and reduces the amount of material that can become airborne.

Existing BP language refers to a revised BMP for street sweeping. Where is the revised BMP found? Is it necessary to specify PM_{2.5}; other high efficiency sweepers remove many fine sediment particles. The use of PM with a subscript may be confusing. PM₁₀ sweepers often refer to particle size of dust discharged during sweeper operations rather than the size of material picked up during sweeping. Is a PM_{2.5} defined elsewhere in the Basin Plan as being capable of picking up 2.5 micron particles, or is it a sweeper that would not discharge 2.5 micron particles?

Page 27 5.12-3

City supports eliminating language requiring all roads need to be retrofitted. It is appropriate to focus on roads which discharge significant loads to Lake Tahoe

Page 28-29 5.16-3

Combined, these sources Page 28
form of NOx and NH3 (ammonia). Page 29

Missing text at page break?

Comments and Discussion on Lake Tahoe TMDL Report - Draft June 2010.

General Comments – We understand that the Substitute Environmental Document is found in Section 16 of the June 2010 Final Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load Report (Final TMDL Report). The Final TMDL Report should be listed in the References section of the LTTMDL BP amendments.

Section 16. Regulatory Analysis

16.4.3 TMDL Implementation Plan

This section identifies a need for intensive roadway operations and maintenance practices and advanced stormwater treatment technologies in order to reduce fine sediment

Comment

Response

See previous comments

Page 26 - Table 5.7-5

Table shows highest concentrations of dissolved nitrogen in recreational land uses. Text on pages 25- 26 on ground water protection and impacts of urbanization doesn't specifically mention recreational land uses. Consider adding a sentence discussing control measures for reducing nitrate concentrations or loads associated with recreational areas, e.g., fertilizer controls, etc.

CSLT-31: Recreational land uses, particularly large turf grass areas, must be appropriately managed to prevent pollutant loading to groundwater. The Water Board has the authority to issue Waste Discharge Requirements to large turf grass areas as needed. No additional language is needed in the Basin Plan to highlight this pollutant source.

Page 27 – pg 5.12-2

The revised BMP for street sweeping discusses the efficiency of different types of sweepers and requires sweeping at least once a year. Street sweeping with high efficiency (PM_{2.5}) sweepers removes many fine sediment particles that could be potentially entrained in urban runoff and reduces the amount of material that can become airborne.

Existing BP language refers to a revised BMP for street sweeping. Where is the revised BMP found? Is it necessary to specify PM_{2.5}; other high efficiency sweepers remove many fine sediment particles. The use of PM with a subscript may be confusing. PM₁₀ sweepers often refer to particle size of dust discharged during sweeper operations rather than the size of material picked up during sweeping. Is a PM_{2.5} defined elsewhere in the Basin Plan as being capable of picking up 2.5 micron particles, or is it a sweeper that would not discharge 2.5 micron particles?

CSLT-32: The referenced language has been eliminated from the proposed Basin Plan Amendment. The revised reference to street sweeping now reads:

“Street sweeping with high efficiency sweepers (capable of removing particles 10 microns and less) removes many fine sediment particles that could be potentially entrained in urban runoff and reduces the amount of material that can become airborne. Sweeping following traction abrasive application can also prevent abrasive material from being pulverized into finer sediment particles.”

Page 27 5.12-3

City supports eliminating language requiring all roads need to be retrofitted. It is appropriate to focus on roads which discharge significant loads to Lake Tahoe

CSLT-33: Refer to Response CSLT-32

Page 28-29 5.16-3

Combined, these sources Page 28
form of NOx and NH3 (ammonia), Page 29

Missing text at page break?

CSLT-34: The missing text was caused by a document conversion error at the page break. The error has been corrected. For reference, the complete sentence reads:

“Combined, these sources contribute an estimated 218 metric tons of total nitrogen to Lake Tahoe, most of it in the form of NOx and NH3 (ammonia).”

Comments and Discussion on Lake Tahoe TMDL Report - Draft June 2010.

General Comments – We understand that the Substitute Environmental Document is found in Section 16 of the June 2010 Final Lake Tahoe Total Maximum Daily Load Report (Final TMDL Report). The Final TMDL Report should be listed in the References section of the LTTMDL BP amendments.

CSLT-35: Water Board staff have incorporated the suggested changes into the proposed Basin Plan Amendment.

Section 16. Regulatory Analysis

16.4.3 TMDL Implementation Plan

This section identifies a need for intensive roadway operations and maintenance practices and advanced stormwater treatment technologies in order to reduce fine sediment

pollutant load from urban stormwater runoff. Specific implementation actions, which may be selected by responsible parties (such as MS4 permittees) are listed. It is reasonably foreseeable that MS4 permittees would need to utilize many of the following specific implementation actions listed on pages 16-4 and 16-5 to meet pollutant load reduction requirements in the urban uplands and atmospheric deposition source categories:

Urban Uplands

- Stabilize and re-vegetate road shoulders
- Vacuum-sweep streets (in heavily sanded areas)
- Upgrade fertilizer / turf management practices to reduce nutrient application
- Require education for turf managers
- Control retail fertilizer sales within the Basin
- Recommend landscaping practices that reduce nutrient mobilization
- Remove impervious coverage (increase infiltration)
- Install and maintain infiltration trenches
- Install and maintain prefabricated infiltration systems
- Install and maintain detention basins
- Install and maintain stormwater vaults
- Install and maintain wet basins / infiltration basins
- Install and maintain constructed wetlands
- Install and maintain media filters in stormwater vaults
- Apply advanced deicing strategies

Atmospheric Deposition

- Vacuum sweep streets
- Pave dirt roads at access points
- Limit speed on unpaved roads
- Apply gravel to or pave unpaved roads
- Require adequate soil moisture or other dust suppression techniques during earth moving operations
- Reduce emissions from residential wood burning
- Reduce the total number of vehicle trips

The City has, in the past, had the support of federal or state grant programs to design, acquire land, and construct projects incorporating the underlined implementation actions listed above. Maintenance of constructed facilities has been funded by the City. Construction of new water quality projects is expected to be an important component of the City's pollutant load reduction strategy, but continued support from state and federal grants would be needed.

16.6 Environmental Checklist and Analysis 13. Public Services

As noted in the discussion of economic issues above and below, if large amounts of federal and state funding (largely for capital projects) are not available, the City would have serious difficulties trying to fund a program that could load reduction milestones. In order to meet the pollutant load reduction milestones, City funds would need to be diverted from other City programs, and there would be a reasonably foreseeable impact on the ability for the

Comment

pollutant load from urban stormwater runoff. Specific implementation actions, which may be selected by responsible parties (such as MS4 permittees) are listed. It is reasonably foreseeable that MS4 permittees would need to utilize many of the following specific implementation actions listed on pages 16-4 and 16-5 to meet pollutant load reduction requirements in the urban uplands and atmospheric deposition source categories:

Urban Uplands

- Stabilize and re-vegetate road shoulders
- Vacuum-sweep streets (in heavily sanded areas)
- Upgrade fertilizer / turf management practices to reduce nutrient application
- Require education for turf managers
- Control retail fertilizer sales within the Basin
- Recommend landscaping practices that reduce nutrient mobilization
- Remove impervious coverage (increase infiltration)
- Install and maintain infiltration trenches
- Install and maintain prefabricated infiltration systems
- Install and maintain detention basins
- Install and maintain stormwater vaults
- Install and maintain wet basins / infiltration basins
- Install and maintain constructed wetlands
- Install and maintain media filters in stormwater vaults
- Apply advanced deicing strategies

Atmospheric Deposition

- Vacuum sweep streets
- Pave dirt roads at access points
- Limit speed on unpaved roads
- Apply gravel to or pave unpaved roads
- Require adequate soil moisture or other dust suppression techniques during earth moving operations
- Reduce emissions from residential wood burning
- Reduce the total number of vehicle trips

The City has, in the past, had the support of federal or state grant programs to design, acquire land, and construct projects incorporating the underlined implementation actions listed above. Maintenance of constructed facilities has been funded by the City. Construction of new water quality projects is expected to be an important component of the City's pollutant load reduction strategy, but continued support from state and federal grants would be needed.

16.6 Environmental Checklist and Analysis 13. Public Services

As noted in the discussion of economic issues above and below, if large amounts of federal and state funding (largely for capital projects) are not available, the City would have serious difficulties trying to fund a program that could load reduction milestones. In order to meet the pollutant load reduction milestones, City funds would need to be diverted from other City programs, and there would be a reasonably foreseeable impact on the ability for the

Response

City to provide acceptable City public services. In order to provide acceptable City public services, the City would not be able to fund a program capable of meeting pollutant load reduction milestones. This issue should be discussed in the substitute environmental document. If adequate funding is not available due to local, state, or national economic conditions, consider adopting a mitigation measure of reducing pollutant load reduction milestones or stretching out the time allowed to meet estimated % load reduction targets.

16.6 Environmental Checklist and Analysis 17.b and c. Mandatory Findings of Significance – Cumulative Impacts or Substantial Adverse Effects to Human Beings

The checklist indicates less than significant impact, noting that the reasonably foreseeable projects or activities would benefit water quality and the environment. However, the annual costs for these projects and activities (see 16.11.2) for MS4 permittees are expected to be in the tens of millions of dollars per year. Nearly all of the projects have been funded in the past by federal or state grants. With the weak economy, and the ongoing problems with the State budget, it is reasonably foreseeable that a large portion of the estimated costs would need to be picked up by the MS4 permittees. It is reasonably foreseeable that all of these increased costs to local governments could not be mitigated by increased revenue, e.g stormwater fees. If the project ends up requiring MS4 permittees to spend tens of millions of dollars per year, there would be reasonably foreseeable impacts on other government services. Cutting funding for Parks and Recreation or Fire Departments may have cumulative impacts on the environment and substantial adverse effects to human beings, which should be analyzed.

Section 16.7 Alternatives Considered – 16.7.3 Alternative 3: 40 years to Clarity Challenge, 65 years to restore transparency

An alternative allowing 40 years to reach the Clarity Challenge is briefly discussed, noting that overall costs to reach the Clarity Challenge would be higher than in the preferred alternative (20 years to Clarity Challenge). However, no information about the annual costs in the first fifteen years for this alternative is presented. In these challenging economic conditions, funding levels to achieve the preferred alternative may not be sustained. While the goal of achieving the Clarity Challenge in 20 years is a worthy one, and may result in lower overall costs, the economic considerations sections should discuss options to modify load reduction milestones if availability of funding limits the MS4 permittees' ability to complete sufficient implementation activities to achieve the preferred alternatives milestones. Also see Professor Lewis comments below suggesting an estimate of results that could be achieved with 50% or 25% of the proposed expenditures in the first 15-20 years of implementation.

Section 16.10 California Public Health and Safety Code 57004: Peer Review

While peer reviewers generally confirmed the "scientific basis" and "scientific portion" of the regulation or policy establishing a "regulatory level, standard, or other requirement for the protection of public health or the environment", Professor Lewis had concerns about the "enormous cost" of the implementation phase. On page B-80, he states:

"Given the financial realities of the current economy, it might be good to have a companion document, of small size, outlining the results that could be obtained for

Comment

City to provide acceptable City public services. In order to provide acceptable City public services, the City would not be able to fund a program capable of meeting pollutant load reduction milestones. This issue should be discussed in the substitute environmental document. If adequate funding is not available due to local, state, or national economic conditions, consider adopting a mitigation measure of reducing pollutant load reduction milestones or stretching out the time allowed to meet estimated % load reduction targets.

16.6 Environmental Checklist and Analysis 17.b and c. Mandatory Findings of Significance – Cumulative Impacts or Substantial Adverse Effects to Human Beings

The checklist indicates less than significant impact, noting that the reasonably foreseeable projects or activities would benefit water quality and the environment. However, the annual costs for these projects and activities (see 16.11.2) for MS4 permittees are expected to be in the tens of millions of dollars per year. Nearly all of the projects have been funded in the past by federal or state grants. With the weak economy, and the ongoing problems with the State budget, it is reasonably foreseeable that a large portion of the estimated costs would need to be picked up by the MS4 permittees. It is reasonably foreseeable that all of these increased costs to local governments could not be mitigated by increased revenue, e.g. stormwater fees. If the project ends up requiring MS4 permittees to spend tens of millions of dollars per year, there would be reasonably foreseeable impacts on other government services. Cutting funding for Parks and Recreation or Fire Departments may have cumulative impacts on the environment and substantial adverse effects to human beings, which should be analyzed.

Section 16.7 Alternatives Considered – 16.7.3 Alternative 3: 40 years to Clarity Challenge, 65 years to restore transparency

An alternative allowing 40 years to reach the Clarity Challenge is briefly discussed, noting that overall costs to reach the Clarity Challenge would be higher than in the preferred alternative (20 years to Clarity Challenge). However, no information about the annual costs in the first fifteen years for this alternative is presented. In these challenging economic conditions, funding levels to achieve the preferred alternative may not be sustained. While the goal of achieving the Clarity Challenge in 20 years is a worthy one, and may result in lower overall costs, the economic considerations sections should discuss options to modify load reduction milestones if availability of funding limits the MS4 permittees' ability to complete sufficient implementation activities to achieve the preferred alternatives milestones. Also see Professor Lewis comments below suggesting an estimate of results that could be achieved with 50% or 25% of the proposed expenditures in the first 15-20 years of implementation.

Section 16.10 California Public Health and Safety Code 57004: Peer Review

While peer reviewers generally confirmed the "scientific basis" and "scientific portion" of the regulation or policy establishing a "regulatory level, standard, or other requirement for the protection of public health or the environment", Professor Lewis had concerns about the "enormous cost" of the implementation phase. On page B-80, he states:

"Given the financial realities of the current economy, it might be good to have a companion document, of small size, outlining the results that could be obtained for

Response

CSLT-36: The diversion of City funds away from other public services to meet load reduction requirements is considered too speculative and thus is not included in the Substitute Environmental Document. Similarly, such impacts would not be environmental, but rather would be economic, and again, any related environmental impact from the economic impact would be too speculative. The comment suggests the City has failed to consider the possibility of new funding sources.

The Substitute Environmental Document does not need a mitigation measure to address the potential impacts associated with the noted funding concerns.

The Lake Tahoe TMDL will help establish and define the need for ongoing federal and state funding assistance. Local government and private funding will also be needed. The Water Board may consider amending the timeline of the staged implementation of the Lake Tahoe TMDL if financial constraint or other factors affect a jurisdiction's ability to meet the proposed load reduction requirements

CSLT-37: The described uncertainty in funding is speculative and not considered reasonably foreseeable. See Response CSLT-36 above.

CSLT-38: Refer to Response CSLT-36

CSLT-39: Refer to Response CSLT-36

expenditures of 50 percent or 25% of the proposed expenditure. Thus, in the event of a financial hardship, source control could proceed, and still could be meaningful.”

Section 16.11 Economic Considerations

16.11.2 Cost Estimates – identifies average annual capital costs of \$100 million per year for first 15 years. Of the \$1.5 billion needed for the first 15 years, \$1.3 billion is for urban runoff pollutant controls. Estimated Annual O&M costs are \$11 million per year including \$6.0 million per year for urban runoff controls and \$4.5 million for O&M for forested runoff controls. (Not sure why the forested runoff controls O&M are nearly as high as urban upland O&M, given that the 15-year milestone load reductions for FSP for forested uplands are 12%, while urban uplands are 34%.) Atmospheric O&M is estimated at \$500,000 per year.

If the City is responsible for 20% of the urban upland pollutant load, and we assume 20% of costs would be for City projects, programs or activities, the City would need 20% of \$106.5 million per year, or roughly \$21 million per year to meet pollutant load reduction requirements. If federal and state funding sources provide 80% of the funding for the capital projects, the share required by the City and its 20,000 + residents for the remainder of the capital projects (including private and municipal BMPs) and operation and maintenance, would be roughly \$4 million or \$200 per capita per year. If the federal and state funding provides only 50% of the \$21 million per year, the per capita share for the City and residents would be approximately \$500 per capita per year.

This local share would include funding for City projects and programs, as well as private funding used to install and maintain BMPs on private parcels. As the City builds more projects and develop more programs, our O&M and stormwater program costs are expected to increase. The City is working with a financial consultant to develop stable funding sources for stormwater programs and O&M, but a weak local, state, and national economy, and the need for voter approval for any stormwater fees will likely limit the amount of local funding that could be generate in the upcoming MS4 permit term.

While the City and its residents will continue to contribute to pollutant load reduction projects and programs, it is unlikely that local government and residents can pay for the programs and projects needed to meet pollutant load reduction targets without continued major funding support from state and/or federal sources. If large amounts of federal and state support are not available, load reduction targets are unlikely to be met.

If not addressed in the final Basin Plan amendments and associated TMDL documents, the City would need to have these economic issues and contingencies addressed in the updated MS4 permit.

General Comments on Unfunded Mandates

There may be unfunded mandates issues associated with the Lake Tahoe TMDL project. The updated MS4 permit (now scheduled for consideration in late 2011) will be the regulatory tool that provides details on implementation, schedules, and reporting for the Lake Tahoe

Comment

expenditures of 50 percent or 25% of the proposed expenditure. Thus, in the event of a financial hardship, source control could proceed, and still could be meaningful."

Section 16.11 Economic Considerations

16.11.2 Cost Estimates – identifies average annual capital costs of \$100 million per year for first 15 years. Of the \$1.5 billion needed for the first 15 years, \$1.3 billion is for urban runoff pollutant controls. Estimated Annual O&M costs are \$11 million per year including \$6.0 million per year for urban runoff controls and \$4.5 million for O&M for forested runoff controls. (Not sure why the forested runoff controls O&M are nearly as high as urban upland O&M, given that the 15-year milestone load reductions for FSP for forested uplands are 12%, while urban uplands are 34%.) Atmospheric O&M is estimated at \$500,000 per year.

If the City is responsible for 20% of the urban upland pollutant load, and we assume 20% of costs would be for City projects, programs or activities, the City would need 20% of \$106.5 million per year, or roughly \$21 million per year to meet pollutant load reduction requirements. If federal and state funding sources provide 80% of the funding for the capital projects, the share required by the City and its 20,000 + residents for the remainder of the capital projects (including private and municipal BMPs) and operation and maintenance, would be roughly \$4 million or \$200 per capita per year. If the federal and state funding provides only 50% of the \$21 million per year, the per capita share for the City and residents would be approximately \$500 per capita per year.

This local share would include funding for City projects and programs, as well as private funding used to install and maintain BMPs on private parcels. As the City builds more projects and develop more programs, our O&M and stormwater program costs are expected to increase. The City is working with a financial consultant to develop stable funding sources for stormwater programs and O&M, but a weak local, state, and national economy, and the need for voter approval for any stormwater fees will likely limit the amount of local funding that could be generate in the upcoming MS4 permit term.

While the City and its residents will continue to contribute to pollutant load reduction projects and programs, it is unlikely that local government and residents can pay for the programs and projects needed to meet pollutant load reduction targets without continued major funding support from state and/or federal sources. If large amounts of federal and state support are not available, load reduction targets are unlikely to be met.

If not addressed in the final Basin Plan amendments and associated TMDL documents, the City would need to have these economic issues and contingencies addressed in the updated MS4 permit.

General Comments on Unfunded Mandates

There may be unfunded mandates issues associated with the Lake Tahoe TMDL project. The updated MS4 permit (now scheduled for consideration in late 2011) will be the regulatory tool that provides details on implementation, schedules, and reporting for the Lake Tahoe

Response

CSLT-40: Water Board staff look forward to working with the City and other NPDES permittees to draft an updated Municipal NPDES stormwater permit that will meet the needs of all parties involved.

CSLT-41: The Water Board must consider those actions/requirements needed to achieve and maintain water quality standards. If such actions trigger an “unfunded mandate” claim, there is a process to resolve those issues. If the intent of the City is to avoid permit language that could trigger such claims while still requiring compliance with applicable water quality standards, the Water Board is willing to work with the City to accomplish that goal.

TMDL. In working with the Water Board and co-permittees, City staff will consider the status of recent stormwater unfunded mandates claims, appeals of approved claims to be made by the State Water Board, and actions by EPA to strengthen federal stormwater requirements. One strategy would be to identify potential unfunded mandates issues during the review of the proposed updated MS4 permit, and to work with the Water Board to minimize permit language that may trigger the time and expense to process unfunded mandates claims.

Other General Comments after the September 8, 2010 Water Board meeting

Numeric Effluent Limits

We learned at the September 8, 2010 Lahontan Water Board meeting that the proposed numeric effluent limit changes (regarding total iron and grease and oil discharges to surface water, and numeric effluent limits for runoff discharges to infiltration systems) were to be withdrawn, because the proposed changes were not adequately discussed in the environmental document. The withdrawal of proposed changes is important, since earlier in this letter, we supported some of the proposed changes which now are being withdrawn. The proposed changes to Section 5.6 of the Basin Plan and possibly to other sections of the Project are now being modified, and affected parties may not have sufficient opportunity for reviewing and commenting on the new language prior to Water Board consideration of adoption at the November 2010 Board meeting. While we agree that runoff from surfaces that are likely to contain oil, grease and other hydrocarbon pollutants must receive pre-treatment prior to infiltration, withdrawing the proposed modifications to the numeric effluent limits may have significant impacts on project designs and costs, therefore adversely impacting our ability to meet the Clarity Challenge.

Making another set of changes to the Basin Plan to address this issue is possible, but we know that the Basin Plan amendment process is complicated and lengthy. We are concerned that revisiting and revising this section may be delayed, and that our revised MS4 permit would be adopted prior to any updates to this section of the Basin Plan. We recommend Water Board seriously consider making changes to and recirculating the environmental document to include the modifications to the effluent limits similar to those in the July 2010 version of the Proposed Basin Plan Amendments prior to bringing the Lake Tahoe TMDL back to the Water Board for adoption. Taking two extra months to revise the environmental document would also provide the Water Board the opportunity to better address other MS4 permittee comments on the Regulatory Analysis (Section 16) of the Lake Tahoe TMDL Report.

Economic Feasibility and Milestone Load Reductions

At the September 8, 2010 Board Meeting, Mr. Singer spoke of setting the bar (for pollutant load reductions milestones) high, but that the economy may affect the Water Board's approach towards enforcement. If the national and regional economy stays weak, affecting availability of grant funding, local government budgets, and money available for private BMPs, it may be particularly difficult for MS4 permittees to meet the 10 year or 15 year load reduction milestones. It would be appropriate for the Water Board to include language about the Water Board's approach towards enforcement and modifications to the milestone load reduction schedule in the Lake Tahoe TMDL section or other sections of

Comment

TMDL. In working with the Water Board and co-permittees, City staff will consider the status of recent stormwater unfunded mandates claims, appeals of approved claims to be made by the State Water Board, and actions by EPA to strengthen federal stormwater requirements. One strategy would be to identify potential unfunded mandates issues during the review of the proposed updated MS4 permit, and to work with the Water Board to minimize permit language that may trigger the time and expense to process unfunded mandates claims.

Other General Comments after the September 8, 2010 Water Board meeting

Numeric Effluent Limits

We learned at the September 8, 2010 Lahontan Water Board meeting that the proposed numeric effluent limit changes (regarding total iron and grease and oil discharges to surface water, and numeric effluent limits for runoff discharges to infiltration systems) were to be withdrawn, because the proposed changes were not adequately discussed in the environmental document. The withdrawal of proposed changes is important, since earlier in this letter, we supported some of the proposed changes which now are being withdrawn. The proposed changes to Section 5.6 of the Basin Plan and possibly to other sections of the Project are now being modified, and affected parties may not have sufficient opportunity for reviewing and commenting on the new language prior to Water Board consideration of adoption at the November 2010 Board meeting. While we agree that runoff from surfaces that are likely to contain oil, grease and other hydrocarbon pollutants must receive pre-treatment prior to infiltration, withdrawing the proposed modifications to the numeric effluent limits may have significant impacts on project designs and costs, therefore adversely impacting our ability to meet the Clarity Challenge.

Making another set of changes to the Basin Plan to address this issue is possible, but we know that the Basin Plan amendment process is complicated and lengthy. We are concerned that revisiting and revising this section may be delayed, and that our revised MS4 permit would be adopted prior to any updates to this section of the Basin Plan. We recommend Water Board seriously consider making changes to and recirculating the environmental document to include the modifications to the effluent limits similar to those in the July 2010 version of the Proposed Basin Plan Amendments prior to bringing the Lake Tahoe TMDL back to the Water Board for adoption. Taking two extra months to revise the environmental document would also provide the Water Board the opportunity to better address other MS4 permittee comments on the Regulatory Analysis (Section 16) of the Lake Tahoe TMDL Report.

Economic Feasibility and Milestone Load Reductions

At the September 8, 2010 Board Meeting, Mr. Singer spoke of setting the bar (for pollutant load reductions milestones) high, but that the economy may affect the Water Board's approach towards enforcement. If the national and regional economy stays weak, affecting availability of grant funding, local government budgets, and money available for private BMPs, it may be particularly difficult for MS4 permittees to meet the 10 year or 15 year load reduction milestones. It would be appropriate for the Water Board to include language about the Water Board's approach towards enforcement and modifications to the milestone load reduction schedule in the Lake Tahoe TMDL section or other sections of

Response

CSLT-42: The proposed Basin Plan Amendment has been circulated to interested parties for review 30 days prior to the Water Board's November 16, 2010 meeting. Water Board staff have made changes to the proposed stormwater treatment requirements to ensure municipal jurisdictions have the flexibility to plan and implement activities to achieve required pollutant load reductions.

Water Board staff agree that removing the effluent limits for discharges to infiltration systems and removing the Grease and Oil and Total Iron limits is desirable and are working to bring a Basin Plan Amendment to the Board in late 2011 to address this issue.

CSLT-43: As described at the September 8, 2010 Water Board meeting, the Water Board has enforcement discretion provided by the California Water Code to consider factors, including fiscal constraints, that may influence a responsible party's ability to meet Lake Tahoe TMDL load reduction requirements. No additional Basin Plan language is needed to describe this discretion.

Chapter 5 of the Basin Plan. A discussion in the Basin Plan of findings that could provide guidance towards enforcement or milestone schedule revisions would help address MS4 permittee and Water Board member concerns about the feasibility of meeting load reduction milestones if the national and local economy does not improve.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert Erlich". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "R" and "E".

Robert Erlich

Stormwater Coordinator
City of South Lake Tahoe

Comment

Chapter 5 of the Basin Plan. A discussion in the Basin Plan of findings that could provide guidance towards enforcement or milestone schedule revisions would help address MS4 permittee and Water Board member concerns about the feasibility of meeting load reduction milestones if the national and local economy does not improve.

Sincerely,



Robert Erlich

Stormwater Coordinator
City of South Lake Tahoe

Response