State of California
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
LOS ANGELES REGION

ORDER NO. 01-041

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR HITCO CARBON COMPOSITES, INC.

NPDES NO. CA0059048

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (hereinafter Regional Board) finds:

Background

1. Hitco Carbon Composites, Inc (hereinafter Hitco or Discharger) discharges wastewater and stormwater runoff from the facility under waste discharge requirements contained in Order No. 93-028 (NPDES No. CA0059048) adopted by this Regional Board on May 10, 1993. Order No. 93-028 was issued to BP Chemicals, Inc., whose name was changed to SGL Carbon Composites, Inc., then to Hitco Carbon Composites, Inc.

2. Hitco has filed a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) and has applied for renewal of its waste discharge requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Description of Facility

3. Hitco is an aerospace composite manufacturer, involved in assembly and curing of fiberglass, acid leaching of silica cloth, and heat treatment and chemical vapor deposition of carbon disk brakes. The facility is located at 1600 West 135th Street, Gardena, California (Figure 1).

Discharge Description

4. Hitco discharges up to 66,000 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater and storm water runoff into the 139th Street storm drain through Outfall No. 1 (Latitude 33^{o}54'27", Longitude 118^{o}18'20"). Process wastewater previously discharged through Outfall No. 2 has been diverted to the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles. Currently, only storm water runoff (50,000 gpd) is discharged through Outfall No. 2 (Latitude 33^{o}54'27", Longitude 118^{o}18'12"). The storm water discharges from Hitco are regulated under the General Industrial Storm Water Permit (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001, *Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities Excluding Construction Activities*).

December 11, 2000
Revised: March 8, 2001
Revised: March 29, 2001

The wastewater includes cooling tower bleedoff, boiler blow down, reverse osmosis wastes, water softener filter backwash, fire hydrant, irrigation and rinse wastes (Figure 2).

The discharge flows to Dominguez Channel, a water of the United States, above the estuary (begins at Vermont Avenue). The wastewater traverses about 1 mile in the storm drain and about four (4) miles in the Dominguez Channel before reaching the estuary.

5. The existing permit required the Discharger to monitor priority pollutants once during the lifetime of the permit.

The maximum detected concentrations for targeted contaminants in the effluent were:

Contaminant	Units	Maximum Detected Concentrations
pH	pH Units	11.48
Suspended Solids	mg/L	243
Settleable solids	ml/L	0.2
Oil and grease	mg/L	13
$BOD_5 20^oC$	mg/L	150
Turbidity	NTU	140
Total residual chlorine	mg/L	0.14
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	10
Benzo(a)anthracene	µg/L	15
Bromodichloromethane	µg/L	4.8
Bromoform	µg/L	1.7
Chloroform	µg/L	3.7
Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	5.5
Trichlorofluoromethane	µg/L	0.75
Arsenic	µg/L	0.19
Copper	µg/L	0. 29
Chromium	µg/L	0.056
Lead	µg/L	0.0066
Nickel	µg/L	0.026
Zinc	µg/L	0.46

The results for all other priority pollutants targeted were nondetect.

The detected concentrations and the associated detection limits were high for all metals targeted in the October 1994 analysis for priority pollutants. The results reported for copper and zinc (49 and 190 µg/L respectively) exceed the water quality criteria promulgated by CTR. Facility operations did not require the addition of these constituents, nor were they produced during any of the processes. Hence, staff believed the sample results to be an anomaly.

The Discharger conducted supplemental sampling during review of the application. The results indicate that the levels of these constituents present in the discharge are much less

than those reported in the October 1994 sampling. The maximum detected concentrations for copper and zinc during the supplemental sampling was 0.29 and 0.46 µg/L respectively, well below the concentrations detected during the October 1994 sampling. Hence, the metals data from the 1994 sampling event was not used in the RPA analysis.

Wastes discharged to the community sewer system include sanitary discharges, wastes from photo finishing including silver recovery and wastes from acid leaching and neutralization processes.

Storm Water Management

6. Hitco is enrolled in the NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001 (General Permit), *Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities Excluding Construction Activities*. The facility's WDID No. is 4A19S002428. Hitco has implemented a *Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)* to comply with the general NPDES permit for stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity.

Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations

7. On June 13, 1994, the Regional Board adopted a revised *Water Quality Control Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties* (Basin Plan). The Basin

Plan contains water quality objectives for, and lists the following beneficial uses of, the receiving waters:

The Dominguez Channel (at the intersection of Crenshaw and Rosecrans) to Estuary – (Hydrological Unit No. 405.12):

Existing: non-contact water recreation, and rare, threatened or endangered species;
Potential: water contact recreation, municipal and domestic supply, warm freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat.

The Dominguez Channel Estuary:

Existing: contact and non-contact water recreation, commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, marine habitat, wildlife habitat, rare, threatened and endangered species, migration of aquatic organisms, and spawning, reproduction, and/or early development;
Potential: navigation.

The most conservative of the freshwater criteria and the human health criteria for consumption of organisms in the California Toxics Rule are used to protect warm freshwater organisms and potential human health concerns from consumption of the organisms.

8. The State Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan for Control of Temperature in the Coastal and Interstate Water and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* (Thermal Plan*)* on May 18, 1972, and amended this plan on September 18, 1975. This plan contains temperature objectives for Dominguez Channel.

9. Under 40 CFR 122.44, *Establishing Limitations, Standards, and other Permit Conditions*, NPDES permits should also include toxic pollutant limitations if the Discharger uses or manufactures a toxic pollutant as an intermediate or final product or byproduct.

10. Effluent limitation guidelines requiring the application of best practicable control technology currently available (BPT), best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT), and best available technology economically achievable (BAT), were promulgated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) for some pollutants in this discharge. Effluent limitations for pollutants not subject to the USEPA effluent limitation guidelines are based on one of the following: best professional judgment (BPJ) of BPT, BCT or BAT; current plant performance; or water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs). The WQBELs are based on the Basin Plan, other applicable State plans and policies, or USEPA water quality criteria. These requirements, as they are met, will protect and maintain existing beneficial uses of the receiving water.

11. On May 18, 2000, the USEPA promulgated numeric criteria for priority pollutants for the State of California [known as the *California Toxics Rule* (CTR*)* and codified as 40 CFR part 131.38]. On March 2, 2000, State Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or* SIP*).* The SIP was effective on April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through National Toxics Rule (NTR) and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Boards in their Basin Plans, with the exception of the provision on alternate test procedures for individual discharges that have been approved by the USEPA Regional Administrator. The alternate test procedures provision was effective on May 22, 2000. The SIP was effective on May 18, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR.

    The CTR and SIP require dischargers' submittal of data sufficient to conduct the determination of priority pollutants requiring WQBELs and to calculate the effluent limitations. The CTR criteria for freshwater or human health for consumption of organisms, whichever is more stringent, are used to prescribe the effluent limitations in this Order to protect the beneficial uses of the Dominguez Channel.

12. Effluent limitations, toxic effluent standards, and monitoring programs established pursuant to sections 301, 304, 306, and 307 of the federal Water Pollution Control Act and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharges herein.

13. The issuance of waste discharge requirements for this discharge is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code (California Environmental Quality Act) in accordance with Water Code Section 13389.

Watershed Management Approach and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

14. The Regional Board has implemented the Watershed Management Approach to address water quality issues in the region. Watershed management may include diverse issues as defined by stakeholders to identify comprehensive solutions to protect maintain, enhance, and restore water quality and beneficial uses. To achieve this goal, the Watershed

Management Approach integrates the Regional Board's many diverse programs, particularly Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), to better assess cumulative impacts of pollutants from all point and nonpoint sources. A TMDL, is a tool for implementing water quality standards and is based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions. The TMDL establishes the allowable loadings or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody and thereby provides the basis to establish water quality-based controls. These controls should provide the pollution reduction necessary for a waterbody to meet water quality standards. This process facilitates the development of watershed-specific solutions that balance the environmental and economic impacts within the watershed. The TMDLs will establish waste load allocations (WLAs) and load allocations (LAs) for point and non-point sources, and will result in achieving water quality standards for the waterbody.

Dominguez Channel begins at the border of El Segundo and Los Angeles Airport and flows through portions of Hawthorne, Torrance, Gardena, Carson, and Wilmington to the East Basin of the Los Angeles Harbor. The channel is concrete-lined above the estuary (Vermont Avenue). Dominguez Channel receives discharges from highly developed and industrialized areas.

15. The Dominguez Channel estuary is classified as impaired in the 1998 State Board's California 303(d) list. The pollutants of concern, detected in the channel water and sediment, and in the fish tissue, are listed below:

- In sediment: chromium, lead, zinc, DDT, PAHs, and sediment toxicity.
- In fish tissue: lead, aldrin, benthic community effects, Chem A (refers to the sum of aldrin, dieldrin, chlordane, endrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, HCH (including lindane), endosulfan, and toxaphene), chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, and PAHs.
- In water column: copper, lead, ammonia, and coliform.

Known and/or suspected sources of pollution include historical deposits of DDT and PCBs in sediment, discharges and/or spills from industrial facilities; leaching of contaminated ground water, and urban runoff.

16. The TMDL development for the Dominguez Channel watershed is scheduled for fiscal year 2003 beginning with coliform. The TMDLs which are not scheduled for completion within the lifetime of this permit, will include WLAs for the 303(d) listed pollutants. When each TMDL is complete, the Regional Board will adopt WQBELs consistent with the corresponding WLAs. If authorized, a time schedule may be included in a revised permit to require compliance with the final WQBELs.

17. To prevent further degradation of the water quality of Dominguez Channel and to protect its beneficial uses, mixing zones and dilution credits are not allowed in this Order. This determination is based on:

- The 303(d) listed pollutants exceed water column criteria. Since there is no assimilative capacity of the receiving water, a dilution factor is not appropriate and the final WQBEL should be numeric objective applied end-of-pipe.
- The discharge may contain the 303(d) listed pollutants that are bioaccumulative. These

pollutants, when exceeding water criteria within the mixing zone, can potentially result in tissue contamination of an organism directly or indirectly through contamination of sediments with subsequent incorporation into the food chain.

Reasonable Potential Analysis

18. 40 CFR 122.44(D)(1)(ii) requires that each toxic pollutant be analyzed with respect to its reasonable potential when determining whether a discharge (1) causes, (2) has the reasonable potential to cause, or (3) contributes to the exceedance of a receiving water quality objective. This is done by conducting a reasonable potential analysis (RPA) for each pollutant. In performing the RPA, the permitting authority uses procedures that account for existing controls on point and nonpoint sources of pollution, the variability of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the effluent, and the sensitivity of the test species to toxicity testing (when evaluating whole effluent toxicity). Because of effluent variability, there is always some degree of uncertainty in determining an effluent's impact on the receiving water. The SIP addresses this issue by suggesting the use of a statistical approach.

19. The CTR and SIP require that a limit be imposed for a toxic pollutant if (1) the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) is greater than the most stringent CTR criteria, or (2) the background concentration is greater than the CTR criteria. For the pollutants on the 303(d) list, effluent limits derived using the CTR criteria will be imposed in the permit.

20. RPAs were performed for the priority pollutants for which effluent data were available. The input data are based on the effluent data provided in the ROWD and the effluent information in the permit renewal application form. Best professional judgment was used in this proposed Order to determine the presence and reasonable potential of each toxic pollutant.

21. For some pollutants including aldrin, alpha-BHC, chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, several PAHs, PCBs, and toxaphene, that are on the 303(d) list, the applicable water quality objectives are below the levels that current analytical techniques can measure. This is also true for TCDD equivalents, which are not on the 303(d) list for Dominguez Channel. Because the actual presence and loads of these pollutants are unknown, it is reasonably cautious to conclude that the reasonable potential exists for each of these pollutants. Effluent limitations are prescribed for these pollutants in this Order.

22. Until the TMDL and the corresponding WQBELs are adopted, State and Federal antibacksliding and antidegradation policies require that Regional Board actions ensure that the waterbody will not be further degraded. Therefore, water quality objectives/criteria specified in the Basin Plan, the CTR, or the effluent limits from the existing permit were used to set the limits for toxic pollutants that are believed to be present in the effluent and have reasonable potential. Other toxic pollutants may only be monitored to gather data to be used in RPAs for future permit renewals and updates.

23. The previous permit for Hitco (Order No. 93-028) only required that priority pollutants be monitored once during the lifetime of the permit. Hence, there are less than three data points available for most of the priority pollutants. These data are insufficient to perform the statistical RPA prescribed in the SIP.

The metals data collected during the October 1994 sampling event appears to be an anomaly. The detected concentrations and the associated detection limits were high for all of the metals. The results reported for copper and zinc (49 and 190 µg/L respectively) exceed the water quality criteria promulgated by CTR. Facility operations did not require the addition of these constituents, nor were they produced during any of the processes. Hence, staff believed the sample results to be an anomaly.

The Discharger conducted supplemental sampling on January 30 and February 19, 2001. The results indicate that the levels of these the metals present in the discharge (maximum detected concentrations for copper and zinc were 0.29 and 0.46 µg/L respectively) were much less than those reported in the October 1994 sampling event. Hence, the data from the October 1994 sampling event was not included in the RPA for the facility.

24. The discharge from Hitco enters Dominguez Channel near the intersection of Rosecrans Avenue and Crenshaw Boulevard. Since the discharge is continuous, and the receiving water body is 303(d) listed for a number of priority pollutants, effluent limits for those priority pollutants have been prescribed. Since the actual presence and loads of these pollutants are unknown, it is reasonably cautious to conclude that these pollutants are present in the discharge.

Notifications

28. The Regional Board has notified the Discharger, interested agencies, and persons of its intent to issue waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.

29. The Regional Board, in a public hearing, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge and to the tentative requirements.

30. This Order shall serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit pursuant to Section 402 of the Federal Clean Water Act or amendments thereto, and shall take effect at the end of ten days from the date of its adoption, provided the Regional Administrator, USEPA, has no objections.

31. Pursuant to California Water Code Section 13320, any aggrieved party may seek review of this Order by filing a petition with the State Board. A petition must be sent to the State Water Resources Control Board, P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, California, 95812, within 30 days of adoption of the Order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Hitco Carbon Composites, Inc., in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

I. DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. Waste discharged shall be limited to cooling tower bleedoff, boiler blowdown, reverse

osmosis and water softener filter backwash, fire hydrant, irrigation, rinse water and collected stormwater only, as proposed.

2. Discharges of water, materials, thermal wastes, elevated temperature wastes, toxic wastes, deleterious substances, or wastes other than those authorized by this Order, to a storm drain system, tributaries to Dominguez Channel, or waters of the State are prohibited.

B. Effluent Limitations

1. The pH value shall not be less than 6.5 nor greater than 8.5.

2. The temperature of the wastes discharged shall not exceed 100 ^{o}F.

3. The fecal coliform concentration shall not exceed a log mean of 200 MPN/100ml (based on a minimum or not less than four samples for any 30 day period), nor shall more than 10 percent of total samples during any 30-day period exceed 400 MPN/100ml.

4. Toxicity limitations:

a. Acute Toxicity Limitation and Requirements

1. The acute toxicity of the effluent shall be such that: (i) the average survival in the undiluted effluent for any three (3) consecutive 96-hour static or continuous flow bioassay tests shall be at least 90%, and (ii) no single test producing less than 70 % survival.

2. If any acute toxicity bioassay test result is less than 90% survival, the Discharger shall conduct six additional tests over a six-week period. The discharger shall ensure that they receive results of a failing acute toxicity test within 24 hours of the close of the test and the additional tests shall begin within 3 business days of the receipt of the result. If the additional tests indicate compliance with acute toxicity limitation, the discharger may resume regular testing. However, if the results of any two of the six accelerated tests are less than 90 % survival, then the Discharger shall begin a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE). The TIE shall include all reasonable steps to identify the sources of toxicity. Once the sources are identified, the Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to reduce toxicity to meet objective.

3. If any two of the additional six acute toxicity bioassay test result in less than 70% survival, including the initial test, the Discharger shall immediately begin a TIE.

4. The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. CI-6520.

b. Chronic Toxicity Limitations and Requirements

1. This Order contains no numeric limitation for chronic toxicity of the effluent; however, it includes a chronic testing toxicity trigger hereby defined as an exceedance of 1 TU_c in a critical life stage test for 100% effluent. (The monthly median for chronic toxicity of 100% effluent shall not exceed 1.0 TU_c in a critical life stage test.)

2. If the chronic toxicity of the effluent exceeds 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall immediately implement an accelerated chronic toxicity testing according to Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 6520, Item IV.C.1. If the results of two of the six accelerated tests exceed 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall initiate a TIE.

3. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 6520

4. The chronic toxicity of the effluent shall be expressed and reported in toxic units, where:

$$TU_c = \frac{100}{NOEC}$$

The No Observable Effect Concentration (NOEC) is expressed as the maximum percent effluent concentration that causes no observable effect on test organisms, as determined by the results of a critical life stage toxicity test.

5. The discharge of an effluent from Discharge Serial No. 001 with constituents in excess of the following limits is prohibited:

   a. Conventional and non-conventional pollutants:

Constituents	Units	Discharge Limitations 30-Day Average	Daily Maximum
Suspended solids	mg/L	50	150
	lbs/day	52.5	158
Settleable solids	ml/L	0.1	0.3
Oil and grease	mg/L	10	15
	lbs/day	10.5	15.8
$BOD_5 20^oC$	mg/L	20	30
	lbs/day	21	31.5
Turbidity	NTU	50	150
Total residual chlorine	mg/L	----	0.5
	lbs/day	----	0.53

b. 303(d) listed toxic pollutants:

CTR No.	Constituents	Units	Discharge Limitations 30-Day Average	Daily Maximum
5a	Chromium	µg/L	171	343
		lbs/day[1]	0.18	0.36
6	Copper	µg/L	6.7	13.5
		lbs/day[1]	0.007	0.014
7	Lead	µg/L	2.6	5.2
		lbs/day[1]	0.0027	0.0055
13	Zinc	µg/L	61	122
		lbs/day[1]	0.064	0.128
107	Chlordane	µg/L	0.00059	0.0012
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000062	0.0000013
102	Aldrin	µg/L	0.00014	0.00028
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000015	0.00000029
56	Acenaphthene	µg/L	2,700	5,427
		lbs/day[1]	2.84	5.7

			Discharge Limitations 30-Day	Daily

CTR No.	Constituents	Units	Average	Maximum
58	Anthracene	µg/L	110,000	221,100
		lbs/day[1]	116	232
60	Benzo(a)anthracene	µg/L	0.049	0.0985
		lbs/day[1]	0.000052	0.0001
61	Benzo(a)pyrene	µg/L	0.049	0.0985
		lbs/day[1]	0.000052	0.0001
62	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	µg/L	0.049	0.0985
		lbs/day[1]	0.000052	0.0001
64	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	0.049	0.0985
		lbs/day[1]	0.000052	0.0001
73	Chrysene	µg/L	0.049	0.0985
		lbs/day[1]	0.000052	0.0001
108	DDT	µg/L	0.00059	0.00119
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000062	0.0000013
74	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	µg/L	0.049	0.0985
		lbs/day[1]	0.000052	0.0001
111	Dieldrin	µg/L	0.00014	0.00028
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000015	0.00000029
115	Endrin	µg/L	0.03	0.059
		lbs/day[1]	0.0000315	0.000062
112	Endosulfan	µg/L	0.046	0.09
		lbs/day[1]	0.000048	0.0000946
86	Fluoranthene	µg/L	370	744
		lbs/day[1]	0.389	0.782
87	Fluorene	µg/L	1,400	28,140
		lbs/day[1]	1.47	29.6
117	Heptachlor	µg/L	0.00021	0.0004
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000022	0.00000042

	Discharge Limitations	
	30-Day	Daily

CTR No.	Constituents	Units	Average	Maximum
118	Heptachlor epoxide	µg/L	0.00011	0.0002
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000012	0.00000021
103	alpha HCH	µg/L	0.013	0.0261
		lbs/day[1]	0.000014	0.000027
104	beta HCH	µg/L	0.043	0.0925
		lbs/day[1]	0.000045	0.000097
105	gamma HCH (lindane)	µg/L	0.063	0.127
		lbs/day[1]	0.000066	0.00013
92	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	µg/L	0.049	0.0985
		lbs/day[1]	0.000052	0.0001
119-125	PCBs[2]	µg/L	0.00017	0.000342
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000018	0.00000036
100	Pyrene	µg/L	11,000	22,110
		lbs/day[1]	11.6	23.2
126	Toxaphene	µg/L	0.000163	0.0003
		lbs/day[1]	0.00000017	0.0000003

[1] The equation to calculate the mass/day is 8.34 * (flow rate (0.126 mgd)*contaminant concentration (mg/L).

[2] PCBs equals the sum of Aroclor-1242, -1254, -1221, -1232, -1248, -1260, and –1016.

C. Receiving Water Limitations

1. The discharge shall not cause any of the following conditions to exist in the receiving waters at any time:

   a. Floating, suspended or deposited macroscopic particulate matter or foam;

   b. Alteration of temperature, turbidity, or apparent color beyond present natural background levels;

   c. Visible, floating, suspended or deposited oil or other products of petroleum origin;

   d. Bottom deposits or aquatic growth; or,

e. Toxic or other deleterious substances to be present in concentrations or quantities which cause deleterious effects on aquatic biota, wildlife, or waterfowl or render any of these unfit for human consumption either at levels created in the receiving waters or as a result of biological concentration.

2. The discharge shall not cause nuisance, or adversely effect beneficial uses of the receiving water.

3. The discharge shall not cause the following limits to be exceeded in the receiving waters at any place within one foot of the water surface:

a. The pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5, nor caused to vary from normal ambient pH levels by more than 0.5 units;

b. Dissolved oxygen shall not be less than 5.0 mg/L anytime, and the median dissolved oxygen concentration for any three consecutive months shall not be less than 80 percent of the dissolved oxygen content at saturation;

c. Dissolved sulfide shall not be greater than 0.1 mg/L;

d. Total ammonia (as N) shall not exceed concentrations specified in the Basin Plan (June 13, 1994, Attachment H), subject to the following conditions:

The Discharger will have until June 13, 2002, to (1) make the necessary adjustment and/or improvements to met these objectives, or (2) conduct studies leading to an approved less-restrictive site-specific objective for ammonia. If it is determined that there is an immediate threat or impairment of beneficial uses due to ammonia, the objective in Attachment H shall apply, and the timing of compliance will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Executive Officer; and

4. The discharge shall not cause a violation of any applicable water quality standard for receiving waters adopted by the Regional Board or State Board. If more stringent applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to Section 303 of the Clean Water Act, or amendments, thereto, the Regional Board will revise and modify this Order in accordance with such standards.

II. REQUIREMENTS

1. Pursuant to the Water Code Section 13267, the Discharger shall implement the monitoring program of the effluent and receiving water as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program.

2. The Discharger shall immediately implement a Pollutant Minimization Plan (PMP) when there is evidence that a priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation.

   The PMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions and submittals acceptable to the Regional Board:

   a. An annual review and quarterly monitoring of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutant(s), which may include fish tissue monitoring and other bio-uptake sampling;

   b. Quarterly monitoring for the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the influent;

   c. Submittal of a control strategy designed to maintain concentrations of the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the effluent at or below the effluent limitation;

   d. Implementation of appropriate cost-effective control measures for the reportable priority pollutant(s), consistent with the control strategy; and

   e. An annual status report that shall be sent to the Regional Board including:
      - All PMP monitoring results for the previous year;
      - A list of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutant(s);
      - A summary of all actions undertaken pursuant to the control strategy; and
      - A description of corrective and preventive actions to be taken in the following year to maintain/achieve compliance.

3. If the Discharger chooses to pursue a mass offset program, a mass offset plan for reducing the 303(d) listed pollutants to the Dominguez Channel must be submitted for Regional Board approval. This Order may be modified by the Board to allow an acceptable mass offset program.

4. The Discharger shall submit within 90 days of the effective date of this Order for the Executive Officer's approval:

   a. An updated Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that describes site-specific management practices for minimizing storm water runoff from being contaminated, and for preventing contaminated storm water runoff from being discharged directly to waters of the State.

   b. A Best Management Practices Plan (BMPP) that entails site-specific plans and procedures implemented and/or to be implemented to prevent hazardous

waste/material from being discharged to waters of the State. The updated BMPP shall be consistent with the requirements of 40 CFR 125, Subpart K, and the general guidance contained in the *NPDES Best Management Guidance Document*, USEPA Report No. 600/9-79-045, December 1979 (revised June 1981). In particular, a risk assessment of each area identified by the Discharger shall be performed to determine the potential of hazardous waste/material discharge to surface waters.

Both plans shall cover all areas of the facility and shall include an updated drainage map for the facility. The Discharger shall identify on a map of appropriate scale the areas that contribute runoff to the permitted discharge points; describe the activities in each area and the potential for contamination of storm water runoff and the discharge of hazardous waste/material; and, address the feasibility for containment and/or treatment of the storm water. The Discharger shall begin implementing both plans within 10 days of approval by the Executive Officer. The plans shall be reviewed annually and at the same time. Updated information shall be submitted within 30 days of revision.

5. Hitco must notify the Regional Board, in writing, no later than 14 days following each interim date, of its compliance with the interim requirements.

6. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR 122.42(a), the Discharger must notify the Board as soon as it knows, or has reason to believe: (1) that it has begun or expected to begin, to use or manufacture a toxic pollutant not reported in the permit application; or (2) a discharge of toxic pollutant not limited by this Order has occurred, or will occur, in concentrations that exceed the specified limits in 40 CFR 122.42(a).

III. PROVISIONS

1. This Order includes the attached *Standard Provisions and General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements* (Attachment N). If there is any conflict between provisions stated hereinbefore and the attached “Standard Provisions”, those provisions stated hereinbefore prevail.
2. This Order includes the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program. If there is any conflict between provisions stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program and the “Standard Provisions”, those provisions stated in the former prevail.

3. This Order includes the attached *Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Requirements* (Attachment A).

4. This Order may be modified, revoked, reissued, or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR Parts 122.44, 122.62, 122.63, 122.64, 125.62 and 125.64. Causes for taking such actions include, but are not limited to; failure to comply with any condition of this Order; endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity; or acquisition of newly obtained information which would have justified the application of different conditions if known at the time of Order adoption. The filing of a request by the Discharger for an Order

modification, revocation, and issuance or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any condition of this Order.

5. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with SIP Section 2.2.2.A, to incorporate new limits based on future reasonable potential analysis to be conducted, upon completion of the collection of additional data by the Discharger.

6. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise the toxicity language once that language becomes standardized.

7. The Discharger must comply with the lawful requirements of municipalities, counties, drainage districts, and other local agencies regarding discharges of storm water to their storm drain systems.

IV. EXPIRATION DATE

This Order expires on February 10, 2006.

The Discharger must file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with Title 23, California Code of Regulations, not later than 180 days in advance of the expiration date as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements.

V. RESCISSION

Order No. 93-028, adopted by this Board on May 10, 1993, is hereby rescinded, except for enforcement purposes.

I, Dennis A. Dickerson, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region on March 29, 2001.

Dennis A. Dickerson
Executive Officer

/ CDO