RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
THE BOEING COMPANY
SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY
REVISED TENTATIVE ORDER NO. R4-2023-XXXX
NPDES NO. CA0001309

Note: All timely written comment letters are provided to the Board members in their entirety in their agenda packages prior to the Board meeting. This response to comments summarizes the comments for ease of reference, in accordance with 40 CFR § 124.17.

Comment Letter dated August 21, 2023 from Steve Shestag of The Boeing Company

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
1	The Tentative WDR Should Clarify the Prohibition on Dry Weather Discharges to Allow Operation of the Stormwater Treatment Systems (SWTS) as Needed During Periods of No Rain to Create Pond Capacity for Future Rain Events. The Tentative WDR includes a blanket prohibition on dry weather discharges (Section 3.1; Attachment F, Section 4.4.1, page F-53, table and page F-56; and others). As currently written, this would mean that Boeing cannot operate the two stormwater treatment systems during dry weather. It is important that the stormwater treatment systems be allowed to operate, and discharge treated stormwater before, during, and after storms to allow for additional capture capacity within the ponds as needed. As such, Boeing requests that the Permit is modified to clarify that the stormwater treatment system discharges are not considered “dry weather discharges” and therefore not prohibited under the new permit.	The dry weather prohibition does not apply to stormwater that is captured in ponds nor operation of the Stormwater Treatment Systems. The revised tentative Order, Attachment A - Definitions, indicates "Stormwater" is defined as follows: "Stormwater includes runoff, snowmelt runoff, and stormwater surface runoff. *For the purposes of this Order, stormwater also includes any discharge from the stormwater detention ponds at Outfalls 011 and 018* (emphasis added)." As such, operation of the Stormwater Treatment Systems, and any resulting discharge at the respective Outfalls 011 and 018, is not prohibited as it is not considered a dry-weather discharge; it is considered a stormwater discharge covered by the Order.	No action taken.
2	The Tentative WDR Should Not Establish Effluent Limitations for Outfalls 001 or 002; Alternatively, Outfalls 011 and 018 Should be Designated as Benchmark Locations without Effluent Limits. The proposed establishment of Outfalls 001 and 002 as compliance points with water quality based effluent limitations, and the proposed removal of their current	The Los Angeles Water Board disagrees that water quality based effluent limitations should not be established at Outfalls 001 and 002. Section 301(b) of the Clean Water Act requires NPDES permits to include technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary for receiving waters to meet applicable water quality standards. Clean Water Act section 402(p)(3)(A) requires that discharges of storm water runoff from	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	benchmark designation, is inconsistent with the State Water Board's 2006 opinion because it places a second compliance point on surface water that is already subject to effluent limitations at Outfalls 001 and 0018. As such, this new requirement in the Tentative WDR should be revised to designate only one outfall at each of the paired outfalls in the watershed as a compliance point. If the Regional Board believes that some surface water from industrial areas and/or soil contaminated from prior industrial operations may be discharged to Outfalls 001 and 002 that is not treated at Outfalls 011 and 018, then the appropriate change would be to designate Outfalls 001 and 002 as the compliance points, and change Outfalls 011 and 018 to be benchmark locations.	industrial facilities comply with Clean Water Act section 301. 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(d) requires that NPDES permits include water quality based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality standards for receiving waters. Per 40 CFR section 122.45(a), "all permit effluent limitations … shall be established for *each outfall or discharge point* of the permitted facility, except as otherwise provided under § 122.44(k)(BMPs where limitations are infeasible)…" (emphasis added.) The tentative Order does not include BMP-based WQBELs; therefore, effluent limitations must be applied at each outfall or discharge point. (WQ 2006-0012, footnote 40 noting "so long as numeric effluent limitations are appropriate, each outfall must be regulated as a compliance point.") Nevertheless, there is inherent flexibility in the federal regulations as to how the permitting authority establishes the appropriate outfalls and/or discharge points (see 40 § 122.48(b) requiring monitoring in NPDES permits to be "sufficient to yield data which are representative of the monitored activity"). To that end, the NPDES Permit Writers' Manuel states, "The permit writer should specify the appropriate monitoring location in an NPDES permit to ensure compliance with the permit limitations and provide the necessary data to determine the effects of an effluent on the receiving water. The NPDES regulations do not prescribe exact monitoring locations; rather, the permit writer is responsible for determining the most appropriate monitoring location(s) and indicating the location(s) in the permit." (NPDES Permit Writers' Manuel at §8.1.2 (U.S. EPA 2010).) Here, the Los Angeles Water Board evaluated areas of past industrial activity, surface water drainages, proposed cleanup activities, and current treatment in selecting the appropriate	

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		monitoring locations, and by extension the appropriate compliance points. Applying WQBELs at each of these outfalls, including perimeter outfalls that were previously only used as benchmark locations (i.e., Outfalls 001 and 002), is not inconsistent with the State Water Board's Order WQ 2006-0012. In 2006, the State Water Board directed the Los Angeles Water Board to remove compliance points from either Outfalls 001 and 002 or Outfall 011 and 0018 because there was "no evidence that there will be any change in pollutants discharged between Outfalls 011 and 001 or between 018 and 002." (WQ 2006-12, p. 14). As discussed in section 4 the Fact Sheet, and in response to comments 2a – 2g below, multiple lines of evidence indicate that the water that discharges from the interior outfalls (Outfalls 011 and 018) can no longer be considered the same as the water that discharges to the perimeter outfalls (Outfalls 001 and 002). Effluent monitoring is therefore needed to determine compliance with the effluent limitations at both the interior and perimeter outfalls. The Los Angeles Water Board also disagrees that it is appropriate to move the compliance point solely to Outfalls 001 and 002 because the water discharged from Outfalls 011 and 018 can have impacts on water quality and beneficial uses in the area between Outfalls 011 and 001 and Outfalls 002 and 018. Nevertheless, in recognition of the fact that a release of stormwater from the stormwater treatment systems may render sampling at both the interior and perimeter discharge points duplicative (e.g., because sampling of the paired outfalls is merely capturing the same discharge at two different points in time with little change to the character of the discharge), in order to comply with State Board	

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		Order WQ 2006-0012, compliance should be structured to eliminate the risk of "double counting" any violations when the discharges through interior and perimeter outfalls are actually paired. Therefore, the revised tentative Order includes language that counts exceedances at interior and perimeter outfalls in the same drainage area (i.e., Outfalls 011/001 and Outfalls 018/002) as a single violation if the violation occurs during the same discharge event.	
2a	First, there is no change in site conditions from 2006 to today that allow the Regional Board to impose permit requirements that were specifically prohibited in the 2006 Order. Industrial activities ceased in 2006. In addition, the limited areas the Regional Board now asserts could impact stormwater quality at Outfalls 001 and 002 were considered in 2006. And while different from the current stormwater treatment systems at Outfalls 011 and 018, stormwater best management practices (BMPs) and treatment systems also existed at Outfalls 011 and Outfalls 018 in 2006.	The site conditions in 2023 are much different than those represented in Order WQ 2006-0012 and known at the time. While other BMPs may have been implemented at Outfalls 011 and 018 in 2006, it was several years afterwards that the advanced stormwater treatment systems and their practice of operation were introduced in the 2010-2011 timeframe. Most importantly, analysis of monitoring data shows that flows from the interior outfalls are not the same as flows from the perimeter outfalls. The soils data supporting this conclusion was not available in 2006. They were obtained from the 2019 and 2021 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)Facility Investigation (RFI) Data Summary and Findings Reports. Therefore, the full scope of the site's conditions was not known and could not be considered in 2006. See also response to comment No. 2.	No action taken.
2b	Second, even assuming arguendo that despite no changed conditions, the Board has a new analysis that identifies other potential sources of industrial residuals from historic site operations that now potentially contribute to surface water flow at Outfalls 001 and 002 (which Boeing disputes), it would not permit the Regional Board to set effluent limits for all four of the paired outfalls. At most, it could serve as a basis for	While it is not uncommon to locate monitoring points at the boundary of a site, it is also not without precedent to establish limits at outfalls located within the interior body of the site, such as the previous Outfalls 012 through 017. SSFL is unique and complex when considering the large size of the facility and also the different receiving waters the facility drains into. The receiving waters are located within the Site boundary as well as outside of it. The identification of constituents from historic site operations and the	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	moving the boundary of the "site" to the property perimeter, such that Outfalls 001 and 002 would be compliance points, and Outfalls 011 and 018 would be benchmark locations. Locating monitoring points/outfalls at the property boundary is not inconsistent with the requirements of the Clean Water Act.	potential for mobilization of these contaminants to the receiving waters is a more relevant concern than the property lines themselves. Impacts of historic site operations have been detected in sediment, seeps, and springs within the undeveloped portion of the Site between Outfalls 018 and 002 (see also the discussion on pages F27-28 of the Fact Sheet). In this aspect, the monitoring data gives cause to establish compliance points at all four of the Outfalls 001, 002, 011 and 018 in order to protect the receiving waters both within and outside of the SSFL boundaries. See also response to comment No. 2.	
2c	Third, Board Staff omits in its analysis that Outfalls 001 and 002 contain all of the contaminants that 011 and 018 contain, respectively. And even if Board Staff is correct that Outfalls 001 and 002 receive contributions from other industrial water sources, and thus contain additional industrial contaminants than water at Outfalls 011 and 018 (which Boeing disputes), they duplicate any industrial contaminants contained in Outfalls 011 and 018. As such, the State Board's analysis still applies because the surface water sampled at Outfalls 001 and 002 contain 100% of the surface water sampled at Outfalls 011 and 018, and any exceedances would subject Boeing to double counting.	Analysis of monitoring data submitted by the Discharger for comparison of Outfall 001 with Outfall 011 and Outfall 002 with Outfall 018 was conducted from the 2nd quarter of 2015 through the 1st quarter of 2023. No data were omitted in this review. It is not enough to specify that contaminants are the same to make a determination that the discharge is the same. Rather, for the discharge to be considered the same the contaminants would need to be the same contaminants detected at both outfalls during the same discharge, which is generally interpreted as occurring on the same day. The 2006 Order represented the interior and perimeter outfalls as the same "without any change in flows or discharge in the interim and with only open space between them." However, multiple lines of evidence indicate that the flow and constituents detected in the flow were not representative of the same discharge. As explained in response to comments 2 and 2.b, discharges from Outfalls 018 and 011 can impact water quality and beneficial uses in the area between Outfalls 018 and 002 and Outfalls 011 and 001.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
2d	Fourth, Staff provides no data to support the assertion that industrial contaminants that may be in surface water from the limited areas Staff identifies as not being treated by Outfalls 011 and 018, would actually reach Outfalls 001 and 002. In fact, these other alleged source areas are primarily in locations that may not even connect to the drainages to Outfalls 001 and 002 (e.g. intermittent streams). Even assuming that they are connected, they are located so far from Outfalls 001 and 002 that any potential industrial contaminants in the water that reaches Outfalls 001 or 002 would be so diluted with surface water from over 1,300 acres of surface water from undeveloped areas, that any detections would not likely be from the alleged additional industrial residuals. As such, almost all, if not all, of the constituents detected at Outfalls 001 and 002 are either from the water discharged from Outfalls 011 and 018, respectively, or naturally occurring sources picked up in surface water as it traverses the approximately 1,300 acres of undeveloped land that is located between the paired outfalls (i.e. it is the “the same water” at each of the paired locations).	When analyzing data for comparison, the Los Angeles Water Board considered concentrations of constituents, the distance of Outfalls 001 and 002 from the source of industrial activity, and the possibility of dilution from runoff generated in the undeveloped area. For this analysis, data were used from discharge events that occur on the same day, within the same drainage, of the same constituent. Data analysis results show that concentrations in the perimeter outfalls were higher than the interior outfalls on many occasions. As shown in page F-28 of the Fact Sheet, the copper concentration was higher at the downstream Outfall 002 on February 18, 2017, compared to Outfall 018. The source of the increased copper concentration is not known, and the Los Angeles Water Board is not able to speculate at this point if it is naturally occurring or if it from soils contaminated by industrial activity that have migrated further into the undeveloped portion of the Site over the years. However, based on available information, these discharges appear to be associated with past industrial activity. The RFI Reports identify locations where chemicals historically may have been used, stored, spilled, or discharged within the area between the interior and perimeter outfalls. As such, the Los Angeles Water Board disagrees with the Discharger's assertion that the constituents detected at the perimeter outfalls are from natural background or from the interior outfalls.	No action taken.
2e	Fifth, requiring multiple compliance monitoring points at interior and perimeter locations in the same watershed is unreasonable, burdensome and unnecessary. The same water does not need to be regulated at both the interior monitoring point and at the site boundary. That logic would allow the Regional Board to set effluent limitations and monitoring locations at multiple internal BMP locations, even though the surface water from each of those BMPs	See response to comments No. 2 and No. 2b above.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	flows to an outfall with effluent limitations at the site boundary. Indeed, the State Board's 2006 Order anticipated this issue and called upon the Regional Board to avoid duplication generally between interior and perimeter outfall violations.		
2f	The upgrade of treatment technology at an existing outfall does not warrant a change in compliance status. The "initiation of remediation activities" has not added any new or different wastes that were not already identified from historical activities and already was the basis for the NPDES permit, the outfall locations, and the constituents required to be monitored. The Reasonable Potential Analysis for these outfalls has not added additional constituents to be monitored as a result of this upgrade.	The upgrade in treatment technology provides a basis for the understanding of the water quality conditions at the site. The stormwater treatment systems use advanced treatment technologies consistent with the treatment for potable water, yet the water quality at the downstream outfalls show very different results. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has identified the upper portion of the undeveloped area of the Site as impacted by industrial activities. Although the constituents of concern identified by DTSC have not changed, the initiation of the remediation activities can and will disturb the soil, potentially mobilizing the associated pollutants, thereby impacting water quality in stormwater runoff. Based on the reasonable potential analysis using the most recent data, the revised tentative Order does in fact include new effluent limitations and monitoring for several pollutants. For Outfalls 001, 002, 011, and 018 the following new pollutants with effluent limitations have been added: Aluminum, Heptachlor, and Indeno(1,2,3cd) pyrene.	No action taken.
2g	Setting effluent limits for Outfalls 001 and 002 essentially doubles the risk that Boeing will be held to be in violation, while providing no further protection of the water leaving the site. As with the State Board's discussion of interior and perimeter outfalls in its 2006 Order, we believe that principles of consistency and efficiency dictate that there is no reason to expand the number of outfalls subject to effluent limitations. This is	As stated in the revised tentative Order, Section 7.17. "Compliance with Outfalls in the same drainage (Outfalls 001, 002, 011, & 018) - For outfalls in the same drainage area, effluent limitation violations involving the same pollutant parameter will be treated as a single violation if the violations occur during the same discharge event." This is further discussed in the Fact Sheet on page F-29. The language in the revised tentative Order is consistent with the direction in WQ 2006-0012 to not double count violations in the same	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	especially true given the enhanced treatment now occurring at Outfalls 011 and 018. There is no reason to suspect that identifying these outfalls for effluent limitations is related to downstream water quality if those limitations are imposed at Outfalls 001 and 002.	drainage that reflect exceedances of WQBELs in the same water. Should the enhanced treatment systems be fully functioning, and no bypass events occur, there should be no risk of doubling the violations. Additionally, the revised tentative Order allows for the Discharger to collect additional samples should discharge events not be sequential to offset any potential for duplicative violations.	
3	The Tentative WDR Should Not Regulate Constituents that are Naturally Occurring (such as: Aluminum, Manganese and Sulfate). NPDES jurisdiction for Santa Susana exists due to the presence of "significant materials" from former industrial activities that exist at the site in impacted soils. The Permit should not regulate or impose effluent limits on constituents in soil from sources that are naturally occurring. Since aluminum, manganese and sulfate are naturally occurring at Santa Susana and not known to be contaminants in soil or groundwater because of former industrial operations, Boeing requests that a new effluent limit for aluminum not be added to the Permit and that the existing effluent limits for manganese and sulfate be removed from the Permit.	The Los Angeles Water Board disagrees with the premise that naturally occurring constituents should not be regulated. The Clean Water Act defines the term "pollutant" to include "dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials, heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste discharged into water." (33 U.S.C. § 1362(6).) There is no exemption for "naturally occurring" pollutants. The Los Angeles Water Board also disagrees that aluminum, manganese and sulfate are solely present at the Site because they are naturally occurring. It is undisputed that the former industrial activities at the Site included "research, development, assembly, and testing of rocket engines, small nuclear reactors, and chemical lasers." (Fact Sheet, Part 2) Aluminum, manganese and sulfate have a number of industrial applications that are relevant to these activities. For example, aluminum is a component in solid rocket propellants as well as a building material for space shuttles and equipment. [FN1]. The Los Angeles Water Board acknowledges that aluminum has not previously been identified as a constituent of concern. However, this does not eliminate the need for effluent limitations where stormwater exposed to past industrial activity at SSFL has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable state or federal water quality standard.	~~Remove sulfate limit at Outfall 008.~~ No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		All data collected during the current permit term shows that aluminum exceeded applicable water quality objective of 1 mg/l at all outfalls. In addition, manganese and sulfate are identified by DTSC as constituents of concern in the soil and groundwater in areas of past industrial activity at SSFL (Master_RFI_Data_Gap_WP_Addendum_IEL_Revised_07_2013.pdf (dtsc-ssfl.com)and 69378_2007_Consent_Order_for_Corrective_Action.pdf (dtsc-ssfl.com)) and have been regulated under this NPDES permit for many years. There is evidence that manganese has reasonable potential because it exceeded the effluent limitations of 50 ug/l. Further, sulfate data collected over the current permit term has shown sulfate concentrations to be near or exceeding limits for all outfalls ~~except Outfall 008~~. ~~Sulfate concentrations at Outfall 008 were very low, more than 10 times lower than the existing limit. As such, the revised tentative Order retains the effluent limitations for aluminum and manganese at all outfalls, but it agrees to remove the effluent limitation for sulfate at Outfall 008, in consideration of the extensive remediation efforts in this drainage through targeted soil excavation and implementation of BMPs and the interim soil removal action.~~ [FN1] Aerospaceweb.org, Ask a Rocket Scientist, Propulsion Questions, “Solid Rockets & Aluminum (“Adding chunks of aluminum to the mixture of fuel and oxidizer is one common technique to increase the thrust a solid rocket produce” available at https://aerospaceweb.org/question/propulsion/q0246.shtml; “The Evolution of Constellium Al-Li Alloys for Space Launch and Crew Module Applications, dated February 11, 2019 noting that “the vast majority of both old and new rockets rely on aluminum solutions due to the material’s light weight and cost." (https://www.lightmetalage.com/news/industry-	

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		news/aerospace/article-the-evolution-of-constellium-al-li-alloys-for-space-launch-and-crew-module-applications); and "NASA Takes Aluminum to the Final Frontier" (https://www.aluminum.org/nasa-takes-aluminum-final-frontier).	
4	The Tentative WDR Should Establish Monitoring Requirements that Fully Consider the Provisions of the Water Code Section 13267 and Reflect Site Conditions. The burden of continued monitoring and reporting of analytes that have never been detected at the Site is not reasonable under existing site conditions. Boeing understands that cleanup activities of the historical soil contamination from past industrial activities at the Site may change the site conditions allowing for detections of previously unseen contaminants; however, it should be noted that during the performance of the two largest soil cleanups in the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds, these analytes were not detected in stormwater discharge.	The monitoring and reporting requirements in the permit are imposed as authorized by California Water Code section 13383 as well as federal laws and regulations, including Clean Water Act section 308, and sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), and 122.48 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Monitoring and reporting requirements in NPDES permits are not imposed based on the authority in California Water Code section 13267 (State Water Board Order WQ 2021-005, p. 12.). Moreover, California Water Code section 13383 does not require a consideration of the burden relative to the benefits of the monitoring program reports. The Los Angeles Water Board has also considered the interim soil removal actions in the Outfall 008 and 009 watersheds in developing this revised tentative Order. As excavation and other cleanup activities continue, there is the opportunity for exposing soil contamination such that stormwater could transport it offsite. Additionally, while pollutants may not have been detected in the past, with climate change and the resulting more intense storm events and increased frequency of wildfires, it is possible that there may be changes in the nature and quality of stormwater discharges. It is important that monitoring is in place to address these changes. The data are important for identifying any new pollutants or increases in pollutant concentrations and are necessary to complete the reasonable potential analysis during the next permit renewal process. Hence, the Los Angeles Water Board finds that the monitoring requirements outlined in the revised tentative Order are necessary and reasonable for evaluating the pollutants present in the stormwater discharges from the Facility.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
5	The Tentative WDR Should Not Specify Water Temperature Requirements at Monitoring Locations. Outfalls at the Site are the headwaters of their respective creeks and the drainages that they discharge to, and are intermittent, only occurring during rain events or operation of the stormwater treatment systems. Boeing conducts no operations at the Site that would alter surface water temperature. Offsite monitoring locations are far from Santa Susana, so stormwater discharge from the Site likely would not influence temperature at those locations. Also, Boeing does not control the temperature of surface water bodies located far from the Site.	The revised tentative Order protects beneficial uses for inland surface waters with a warmwater habitat (WARM) beneficial use designation. Implementation of the Basin Plan is applied fairly and equally across the region to protect these beneficial uses applicable to inland surface waters. Temperature effluent limitations are a standard requirement in NPDES permits for industrial discharges in the Los Angeles Region. (See e.g., Order No. R4-2022-0159 for the Long Beach Generating Station, R4-2022-0260 for the Tesoro Logistics Marine Terminal, and Order R4-2020-0025 for the Ultramar, Inc. Olympic Tank Farm.) NPDES permits issued for SSFL have included numeric effluent limitations for temperature since 2004. The revised tentative Order proposes to revise the effluent limitation from 86 °F to 80 °F to align the temperature effluent limitations with the applicable WARM water quality objective in the Basin Plan. While discharges of stormwater generally occur when it is not hot, it is appropriate to retain temperature effluent limitations because discharges of stormwater, can cause changes in the temperature of receiving waters which can adversely affect aquatic life. To the extent possible, the Discharger shall control the factors affecting the temperature of the stormwater collected in the ponds prior to discharge, including but not limited to volume of stormwater and flow conditions in the receiving water at the time of discharge. Retaining the temperature effluent limitations ensures that the beneficial uses in the receiving waters are protected.	No action taken.
6	The Tentative WDR Should Not Require Monitoring for Constituents Outside of Boeing's Control and Influence. Discharges from Outfall 009 ultimately flow into Arroyo Simi but do not discharge directly into Arroyo Simi at the point of compliance (the Frontier Park sampling location is approximately four miles	Arroyo Simi is the ultimate receiving water for stormwater discharges from the northern portion of the Site. Water quality objectives (WQOs) are established to protect the beneficial uses in Arroyo Simi. WQOs are incorporated into the permit as receiving water limitations. The proposed revised tentative Order includes provisions to ensure that the stormwater discharges from SSFL do not cause an	No action taken

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	from the Santa Susana Site). Arroyo Simi receives inputs from residential, commercial and industrial areas upstream of the point where Outfall 009 discharges into Arroyo Simi, Boeing cannot control, and is not responsible for, these other various inputs of contaminants into Arroyo Simi.	exceedance of receiving water limitations in the waterbodies downgradient from the site, and monitoring is essential to determine compliance with these permit provisions. The Los Angeles Water Board has considered the various land uses upstream of the receiving water monitoring location in establishing the requirements. As a result, Table E-6 notes for monitoring location RSW-002 (Frontier Park, ~4 miles from SSFL) specifies that no additional daily sampling for E. coli is required in response to an exceedance of the yearly sample when there is no observed discharge from the Site.	
7	The Tentative WDR Should Not Include New Receiving Water Location RSW-003. Addition of a second receiving water monitoring location RSW-003 in Arroyo Simi will not provide data relevant to the Site and will not be comparable to the downstream receiving water location at RSW-002. RSW-002 is approximately 2.8 miles downstream from the proposed upstream receiving water location RSW-003. This 2.8-mile stretch of Arroyo Simi includes multiple additional contaminant sources that are not related to Santa Susana.	The revised tentative Order includes the addition of monitoring requirements at an upstream location of the Facility to assess the ambient background concentration of the receiving water prior to effluent discharges. These data will be informative to establish baseline data for the upstream Arroyo Simi receiving water and will used to determine if any exceedance in the receiving water is the result of a discharge from the Facility. This information will also be used to conduct the reasonable potential analysis for the next permitting term and is consistent with the data requirements in section 1.4.3 of the State Implementation Policy.	No action taken.
8	Comment to propose language to Attachment F for "Errata". 1) Section 1.2 Paragraph 2, last sentence, change: “Attachment C-1-4 provide flow schematics of engineered stormwater treatment systems at the Facility”. 2) Section 2 Paragraph 3, last sentence, add: “Two of the test stand complexes and the associated spillways remain onsite”. 3) Section 2.2 Paragraph 3, change: “stormwater is currently collected from Outfall 013 and transported to the Silvernale Pond. Demolition at Bravo test stand removed the collection and	The Los Angeles Water Board agrees to incorporate the proposed errata.	Revisions made to the revised tentative Order.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	conveyance apparatus associated with Outfall 013" to ""The Bravo test stand complex has been removed. Stormwater is currently allowed flow naturally to Silvernale Pond for treatment, monitoring, and discharge via Outfall 018." For Attachment G: 4) Section 6.E, Paragraph 3, last sentence. The footnote reference should be changed from "1" to "12".		

Comment Letter from August 17, 2023 from Peter Kozelka of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
9	EPA strongly supports the draft permit, and we specifically support the addition of effluent limits and monitoring requirements at outfalls 001 and 002. In previous permits, outfalls 001 and 002 only had benchmark requirements based on a 2006 finding that these outfalls were duplicative of two other locations, outfalls 011 and 018. However, the Water Board appropriately explained in the fact sheet as to how conditions have changed, including that stormwater treatment is different at each outfall. The Water Board also included additional evidence that the outfall-specific discharges are distinct in character and timing. Therefore, by establishing these water quality-based effluent limitations instead of using prior benchmarks, the requirements at outfalls 001 and 002 will ensure protection of water quality standards, consistent with the Clean Water Act § 301(b)(1)(C).	The Los Angeles Water Board agrees with EPA Region 9's comment regarding the propriety and necessity of adding effluent limits and monitoring requirements at Outfalls 001 and 002 and the bases for these regulatory additions in the revised tentative Order. As noted by EPA, the Los Angeles Water Board considered the potential for change at SSFL and determined, based on evidence presented, that the perimeter Outfalls had different characteristics and were not the same water that was described in the State Water Board 2006 Order.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
10	Monitoring is used to characterize waste streams and receiving waters, evaluate treatment efficiency, support future permit development, and determine compliance with permit conditions. As cited in the fact sheet, monitoring requirements are at 40 CFR §§122.44(i) and 122.48. To accurately characterize the discharge, monitoring (i.e.; locations and/or frequency) might be increased for wastewaters with highly toxic pollutants or where the pollutants varies, which is the case at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory. Further, effluent monitoring locations should provide a representative sample of the effluent being discharged. Given the historical industrial nature of the site, ongoing clean-up, and rationale provided in the fact sheet (i.e.; different treatment systems, different pollutant concentrations, different discharge frequency, etc.), EPA supports the Water Board's decision to include monitoring at both sets of outfalls (001/002 and 011/018). Furthermore, the discharges flow into two impaired waterbodies, the LA River and Calleguas Creek. Discharge monitoring at these outfalls is appropriate to collect additional data related to the presence or absence of the impairing pollutant(s) to provide information for further analyses, including future permit development.	The Los Angeles Water Board agrees with EPA Region 9's comment regarding the necessity of monitoring requirements as a regulatory tool to determine compliance. Monitoring is a form of regulation implemented under the full authority of federal, state and local requirements. The monitoring considerations include historical industrial activities, recent stormwater data, and, particularly in the case of SSFL, ongoing clean-up and extensive remediation activities that are yet to occur. Combined, the collection, analysis, and reporting of monitoring data will be necessary to determine the water quality impacts of discharges from the Facility to the receiving waters and provide information for future permit development.	No action taken.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
THE BOEING COMPANY
SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY
REVISED TENTATIVE ORDER NO. R4-2023-XXXX
NPDES NO. CA0001309

Email Comment from August 21, 2023 from Michael Robkin, Bell Canyon Community Services District

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
11	Please clarify the differences in assumptions, requirements, and/or hydrographic models that will account for the difference between the rainfall runoff numbers for Boeing's NPDES permit and from LA DOT for the Bell Canyon area watershed. We are concerned that the models of runoff and precipitation and the data supporting the NPDES Permit for the Boeing Company Santa Susana Field Laboratory No. CA0001309, CI No. 6027 may be flawed as they do not appear to use the same assumptions about precipitation as the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LA DOT). The design point for the volumetric flow rate for that channel is Q=7550 cubic feet per second. That channel collects from a watershed of approximately 15 square miles, including Bell Creek and the smaller creeks flowing east out of SSFL and then south through the West Hills neighborhood of Los Angeles. (see attached Lippincott watershed map). Assuming the channel was flowing at maximum capacity for 1 day, that channel has a transport capacity of (7550 cubic feet/sec * 60 sec/min * 60 min/hour * 24 hours/day * 7.48 gal/cubic foot) 4.88 BILLION gallons of water per day. The NPDES Permit states that maximum water runoff flowing out of SSFL Outfalls 1, 2, 11, and 18 (which all eventually flow into the Bell Canyon Drainage Channel) is 117 MILLION gallons of water per day (see NPDES permit, page 9 notes) this is approximately 1/40th of the design capacity of the Bell Creek Drainage	Rainfall runoff at SSFL outfalls is not estimated by a model but rather measured by flow meters at each of the discharge locations. The revised tentative Order for SSFL limits stormwater discharges to 187 million gallons per day (MGD) across the site. Specifically, regarding Outfalls 001, 002, 011, and 018, the revised tentative Order specifies a maximum discharge of 117.83 MGD into Bell Creek. The commenter provided a flow rate ("Q" value) for Bell Creek Channel equal to 7,550 cubic ft/second which is approximately 4.88 billion gallons per day. However, the commenter does not provide information from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation regarding rainfall runoff for Bell Creek or assumptions and or hydrographic models for comparison. Thus, it is not possible to clarify any differences in rainfall runoff numbers. As the commenter states, the ratio of the Bell Creek Channel's designed capacity is approximately 1/40th (or 2.41% as calculated to the hundredths percent) to the maximum discharge allowed. With the information provided, it is assumed that the engineered channel is designed to have a significant margin of safety for volumetric flow. However, no data is provided to substantiate the statement that rainfall runoff is 7.7 times lower than runoff calculated by the LA DOT. It should be noted that 117.83 MGD is the maximum flow rate at outfalls 001, 002, 011 and 018 that the Discharger is permitted to discharge. Even with the severe storms earlier in 2023, flow data showed that a maximum of approximately 17 MGD was discharged from these outfalls. This is approximately 10% of the permitted allowance.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	Channel. SSFL is 4.45 square miles. Assuming evenly distributed rainfall, the square miles of watershed associated with the Outfalls 1,2,11, and 18 is (118 MGD/187 MGD * 4.45) = 2.8 square miles. Therefore, the SSFL Watershed flowing to Bell Creek approximately (2.8/15) or a little less than a fifth (1/5.3) of the total area feeding the Bell Creek Drainage Channel. It appears that Boeing's NPDES permit calculated that the rainfall runoff from SSFL to Bell Creek is 7.7 times LOWER (in terms of maximum volume of water runoff per square mile per day) than the rainfall runoff calculated by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation for the same geographic area. We recognize that the function of a drainage channel is different than the purpose of a contaminant discharge permit.		

Comment letter August 21, 2023 from Daniel Hirsch, Committee to Bridge the Gap; Melissa Bumstead, Parents Against SSFL; Denise Duffield, Physicians for Social Responsibility-Los Angeles; Jeff Ruch, Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility; and Marie Mason, Rocketdyne Cleanup Coalition

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
12	After hearing troubling testimony on February 10, 2023, about the polluted site and the proposed permit, the Board indefinitely postponed consideration of the controversial proposed permit. The changes made to the proposed permit are largely marginal and cosmetic, and the fundamental problems	The Los Angeles Water Board released draft responses to comments prior to the February 10, 2023, Board meeting. Many of the issues identified in those comments are now moot given the changes made to the tentative Order, which are reflected in the revised tentative Order. To the extent that any of the comments are still relevant, our prior responses are incorporated by reference and	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	remain. Attached please find our January 18, 2022, comments, and the exhibits thereto on the December 2021 proposed tentative permit, and our PowerPoint presentation from the February 2022 hearing, in part responding to staff responses to our comments. These are incorporated herewith by reference. The problems we identified largely remain. We briefly summarize them here	available on our website at the following link: Response to Comments (ca.gov) Responses to comments identifying outstanding concerns are provided below.	
12a	Roughly 90% of the toxic chemicals detected at SSFL are exempted from enforceable limits in the proposed permit. And there are a large number of other hazardous materials that were used at the site or are decomposition products of materials that were used, which also are exempted from enforceable limits.	DTSC identified 351 constituents of potential concern (COPCs) at SSFL in soils, sediment, groundwater, and surface water in Attachment 1 to Appendix D of the 2014 Standardized Risk Assessment Methodology (SRAM), as cited by the commenter in the original comment letter. Due to the nature of these COPCs, many of those that are present in soils, sediment, and groundwater are not present in surface water. Of the 351 COPCs, only 190 were detected in surface water. This is because, for example, well over 100 of the contaminants listed in the attachment are volatile organic compounds (VOCs); these compounds are not generally abundant in surface water because they quickly evaporate, or volatize, into the air in contrast to their persistence in groundwater and or soil. For the 190 COPCs listed in Attachment 1 that are found in surface water, many of them are detected at levels that do not have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above applicable state and federal water quality objectives for surface waters and therefore would not pose a risk to human health and the environment. Consistent with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), the revised tentative Order only includes effluent limits for those COPCs that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion. The reasonable potential analysis in the revised tentative Order is based on a technical analysis of more than 20,000 data points from	Revisions made to the revised tentative Order.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		stormwater monitoring data from SSFL, in addition to information provided by DTSC and the Stormwater Expert Panel to ensure that stormwater discharges from the Site comply with applicable water quality objectives in the effluent and the receiving water. Based on the reasonable potential analysis, 42 of the 190 COPCs have effluent limits in the revised tentative Order. For the ~~148~~ pollutants that do not have effluent limits, there are comprehensive monitoring and reporting requirements in the revised tentative Order to ensure that there are no impacts to human health or the environment. In addition, monitoring requirements and effluent limitations are also established for pollutants that are not in the COPCs, such as MBAS, TSS, toxicity, total dissolved solids, based on other information and the characteristics of the Site. The Los Angeles Water Board may reopen the permit to add in other requirements, including effluent limits, if necessary, based on the monitoring data and other information. In recognition of the commenters' concern, the Los Angeles Water Board has revised the revised tentative Order to require the Discharger to conduct influent monitoring of the remaining constituents of COPCs for all media not already regularly monitored by this permit. This special monitoring is required to be conducted at the Silvernale and R-1 ponds prior to treatment by the stormwater treatments systems, and at Outfalls 008 and 009 for the 1st and 2nd discharge events of the first year after the revised tentative Order becomes effective.	
13	Additionally, no monitoring is required for the great majority of toxic chemicals used at and/or found at the site. What limited monitoring is required is self-monitoring, i.e., by the party responsible for the	See response to comment 12a. From the initial SSFL NPDES permit in the mid-1970s, toxic chemicals have been monitored under the authority of the Clean Water Act. The revised tentative Order continues to list the monitoring requirements in detail in Attachment	Revisions made to the revised

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	pollution and thus of questionable reliability, given the conflict of interest and inherent bias.	E, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP). Approximately 195 chemicals and parameters are monitored at SSFL, including 126 priority toxic pollutants that are listed in the California Toxics Rule (CTR). The MRP has changed over the years to reflect the current understanding of conditions at the site as well as needs to assess and ensure compliance. As appropriate and necessary the list of constituents and or the frequency of monitoring required may be updated. In addition, the revised tentative Order includes new influent monitoring requirements for Per-and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) and additional pollutants at the Silvernale and R-1 ponds and monitoring at Outfalls 008 and 009 to assess the current quality of stormwater prior to treatment by the stormwater treatments systems (see response to comment No. 12). This additional monitoring will provide additional insight on stormwater that is conveyed across the site. The Los Angeles Water Board will utilize the influent data to assess cleanup activities that are occurring at the site and make recommendations, as necessary. All monitoring required in the revised tentative Order includes self-monitoring and reporting under penalty of perjury, as is the requirement for all NPDES permits. In addition, all pollutants collected through self-monitoring must be analyzed by a laboratory that is certified for the analytical method through the State Water Board's Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP). This third party ELAP certified lab ensures quality assured and controlled data for the monitored pollutants.	tentative Order.
14	The monitoring requirements are often only once per year, using detection limits incapable of seeing contamination at the levels of concern, and allowing,	The MRP requirements for this Facility are reviewed and adjusted based on an assessment of monitoring data. The required sampling frequency is once per discharge event for all pollutants where the	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	with the exception of some metals, filtering, which would filter out precisely the contamination one is supposed to monitor for.	monitoring data indicate reasonable potential for that pollutant to cause an exceedance of the water quality standard or are a pollutant of concern at the Site. This includes most metals and radiological pollutants. The remaining pollutants are monitored once per year. All pollutants must be analyzed using U.S. EPA approved analytical methods contained in 40 CFR Part 136. (See part 1.4 of Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program, p. E-2.) Attachment E, p. E-2 also states, "[f]or any pollutant whose effluent limitation is lower than all the MLs specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, the analytical method with the lowest ML must be selected. U.S. EPA methods not included in 40 CFR Part 136 can be used to analyze samples, but the results cannot be used to evaluate compliance. This is the case for PCBs, for which the revised tentative Order requires more sensitive analysis than can be obtained by the methods contained in 40 CFR Part 136, but the results can only be used for information purposes. See also response to comment 19. Regarding the filtering of samples, to clarify, the requirement that samples analyzed must be unfiltered samples (found in Tables 4-6 and E-3 and E-4) is specific to heavy metals, which have both a dissolved component as well as a portion that is associated with sediment particles. Because there are no other pollutants regulated by the permit with separate criteria for the dissolved and particulate portions of the pollutant, by default, the analysis for all other pollutants is to be conducted on unfiltered samples.	
15	To reduce its fines for violation of surface water pollution discharges, Boeing has, with Board approval, re-routed contaminated water from surface water outfalls to unlined ponds such as Silvernale, where the	Silvernale and the R-1 Pond are BMPs and used to temporarily store stormwater that has been re-routed or conveyed from various areas of the Facility. Collection of stormwater from various areas of the Facility allows the stormwater flow to be slowed down, reducing its erosive potential. The stored stormwater is then treated prior to	~~No action taken.~~ Revision made to the

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	polluted water infiltrates into groundwater, further contaminating groundwater.	discharging to surface water drainages. The Ground Water Expert Panel for SSFL has conducted. They report that the annual average recharge across the site is 3.8% of the precipitation, or equal to 17 millimeters per year (Manna, et al, 2016). The water level in the ponds is generally kept low by releasing the collected and treated water to provide storage for future storms; this also reduces infiltration. As detailed in response to comment No. 20b, the additional influent monitoring will provide more insight regarding stormwater impacts in the ponds. Nevertheless, the Los Angeles Water Board has found that uncertainty remains as to the type of pollutants in the influent to the ponds and their potential to reach groundwater. As such, the Los Angeles Water Board is requiring the Discharger to submit an infiltration and design feasibility study to evaluate potential impacts from stormwater discharges to groundwater beneath the ponds and to assess potential design modifications, such as a liner, that could be implemented at the Silvernale and R-1 ponds.	revised tentative Order.
16	Despite the great hazard that they entail, the proposed permit proposes no limits or monitoring for per- and polyfluoroalkyl (PFAS) contamination has become a major public health concern in California, the nation, and across the planet. These so-called “forever chemicals” which do not break down in the environment, meaning that many bio accumulate in the environment — and in us.	Chemicals containing PFAS constituents are widespread and may have been included in the use of or operation of industrial activities at SSFL, including fire-fighting foam material used at SSFL. The Los Angeles Water Board and DTSC approved a PFAS investigation work plan for the Boeing RFI subareas in May 2023 (69909_2023.05.08_DTSC_Approval_of_PRFAS_WP_Boeing.pdf (dtsc-ssfl.com)). A site inspection work plan of PFAS in soil and groundwater at the NASA owned areas at SSFL was also approved by DTSC in March 2022 (70130_2022.03.04_DTSC_Comment_on_PFAS_SI_Workplan.pdf (dtsc-ssfl.com)). Additionally, influent monitoring of PFAS is required for the first two rain events following the effective date of the permit. Results of these studies will provide direction on the necessity of	Revision made to the revised tentative Order.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		further investigation of groundwater and/or expansion of PFAS monitoring to stormwater runoff. Furthermore, the revised tentative Order requires the Discharger to include provisions in the stormwater pollution prevention plan to minimize discharges from the use and clean-up of PFAS-containing aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) during actual firefighting and implement BMPs to address AFFF used for firefighting such as eliminating PFOS- and PFOA-containing AFFFs.	
17	Similarly, the proposed permit is grossly deficient regarding PCBs. We note that PEER submitted a Public Records Act request to the Board on December 7, 2022, regarding key documents about PCBs, and the Board has still failed to produce the full set of records. We have attached in this submission additional detail about the PCB concerns.	The Los Angeles Water Board acknowledges that PEER submitted a request under the Public Records Act in December of 2022 seeking information relevant to the proceeding. The Los Angeles Water Board provided its first production in response to this request on January 27, 2023. While the Los Angeles Water Board is still in the process of locating and reviewing responsive documents, the Los Angeles Water Board notes that the request sought almost 8 years of emails to or from the Los Angeles Water Board's former Executive Officer, Renee Purdy, "that contain the word 'PCBs' in the subject line, body of the text, or any attachments." (Letter from Jeff Ruch, PEER, to Younga Choi dated December 7, 2022, RE: California Public Records Act Request.) Given the large volume of potentially responsive records, the Los Angeles Water Board immediately reached out to the requestor to attempt to narrow the request. (Email from Sophie Froelich to Jeff Ruch dated December 12, 2022, 1:52 pm, re: 12_07_22 PCB_Detection_Limits_PRA (002).pdf/PRA No. 2022120712.) The request was narrowed some, however, there are still significant records to review to responsiveness and privilege (e.g., attorney-client, attorney work-product, deliberative, etc.) Since the Public Records Act request was received, the Los Angeles Water Board has provided non-privileged responsive documents on a rolling	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		basis. To date, seven productions have been made. More importantly, however, all documents describing and/or explaining the PCB monitoring of SSFL's stormwater were compiled and produced on July 18, 2023. Prior to that compilation, the requestor was first provided with information as to how to access the publicly available documents relevant to PCB monitoring at the SSFL Site in December 2022 (Email from Sophie Froelich to Jeff Ruch dated December 12, 2022, 4:45 pm, re: 12_07_22 PCB_Detection_Limits_PRA (002).pdf/PRA No. 2022120712). The Los Angeles Water Board recognizes that the compiled production was a month before the deadline to submit comments on the revised tentative Order, which was publicly noticed on July 21, 2023. However, the compiled information included copies of previous permits and fact sheets, extracted data from the publicly accessible databases, and previously submitted e-mails to members of this commenter group, and was thus not new information. To summarize the compiled information, the rationale for the PCB effluent limits and monitoring requirements in the Tentative Order are explained in Parts 4.3 and 7.2 of the Fact Sheet.	
18	Outfalls 001 and 002 had unenforceable "benchmarks" instead of enforceable limits. Board staff now propose to include enforceable limits for those outfalls. But it then adds a provision that violations of limits (and fines) would be waived at Outfalls 001 and 002 if they were for contaminants that were also violated at Outfalls 011 or 018 during the same rain event. Thus, what the Board staff giveth with one hand it taketh away with the other.	See response to comment No. 2. The State Water Board expressed a concern in Order WQ 2006-0012 that when numeric effluent limitations are applied at interior (Outfalls 011 and 018) and perimeter outfalls (Outfalls 001 and 002), and the discharge is unchanged between the interior and perimeter outfalls, that applying numeric effluent limitations at both the interior and exterior outfalls could result in "double counting" of violations. (WQ 2006-0012, p. 13.) To that end, the State Water Board determined that, based on the information in the record for the 2006 SSFL permit, it was inappropriate for the Los Angeles Water Board to establish compliance points at both at Outfalls 001 and 011 and both Outfalls 002 and 018 because "there is no evidence that there will be any	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		change in pollutants discharged between Outfalls 011 and 001 or between Outfalls 018 and 002." Since the adoption of the 2006 permit, the Los Angeles Water Board has determined that available data and information indicate that the water flowing through the interior and perimeter outfalls is not always the "same" and that it is appropriate to use both interior and perimeter outfalls as compliance points. Nevertheless, to the extent that the water being discharged from the interior and perimeter outfalls is the "same" (e.g., because there is a release from the treatment ponds and sampling at interior and perimeter outfalls would largely capture the same flows at different points in time), then any exceedance that occurs at both the interior and perimeter outfalls must be treated as a single violation according to according to Order WQ 2006-0012. To explain, Order WQ 2006-0012 directs the Los Angeles Water Board to "consider whether there is double counting for violations at more than one outfall and, if there is, avoid this," while also recognizing that the discharges from these outfalls are not always paired (*Id.* at 13.). The Los Angeles Water Board also notes that enforcement is one tool used to address violations. It is not the intent of enforcement to either waive or multiply fines but rather to bring the Discharger into compliance with the applicable permit requirements in a fair and procedural manner.	
19	PCBs Need to Be Monitored Effectively and Permit Limitations for PCBs Should be Added to All Outfalls. Discharge prohibition 3.10 states: "The discharge of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) compounds, such as those once commonly used for transformer fluid, is prohibited, unless specifically authorized elsewhere in this Order." Despite this, there are no effluent limitations for PCBs, at any of the outfalls. PCBs were frequently used at military and defense facilities during	The revised tentative Order continues to require the monitoring of PCBs in stormwater runoff across the site. To the extent the commenter is concerned about the sensitivity of PCB related monitoring, PCBs generally occur as mixtures of congeners; the most common commercial mixtures are called Aroclors. The revised tentative Order requires the Discharger continuously monitor PCBs aroclors **and** congeners using U.S. EPA method 608.3 and 1668c or by using a high-resolution U.S. EPA-approved method. Los Angeles Water Board staff are aware that the reporting limits for PCBs are	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	the 1940s and 1950s and are a long-lived mix of chemicals that remain in the environment for decades. The use of PCBs at this site is acknowledged in the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report. Mentioned in the document is an emphasis on the use of Aroclor 1254/1260 mixtures at the site. An effluent limitation for a major breakdown product of DDT, namely DDE, is included in the tentative permit. There has been a lack of both appropriate detection limits and no analysis for the more relevant form of the chemicals (PCB congeners, rather than just Aroclors). The CTR freshwater criterion for protection of human health from PCBs in water when consuming fish is 0.00017 ug/l, well below the reporting limits in previous monitoring. Thus, none of the monitoring for PCBs conducted to date by the discharger allows for the ability to assess impacts to human health due to the overly high reporting limits and continued reliance on Aroclor analyses.	higher than the CTR criteria. The revised tentative Order states in Attachment E, MRP, "[f]or any pollutant whose effluent limitation is lower than all the MLs specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, the analytical method with the lowest ML must be selected". The proposed U.S. EPA method 1668c for congeners has not been incorporated into 40 CFR 136 yet and is not appropriately used to evaluate compliance. Thus, congeners data will only be used for informational purposes. In summary, PCBs are indeed monitored at SSFL. The revised tentative Order fully implements the requirements of 40 CFR part 136, as written.	
19a	No Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) appears to have been conducted for PCBs. Monitoring for PCBs should be consistent across all the outfalls.	The multi-step procedure for RPA was conducted on all priority pollutants, including PCBs. Note that CTR requires monitoring of all 126 priority pollutants which #119-125 represent the following seven (7) PCBs: Aroclor-1016, Aroclor-1221, Aroclor-1232, Aroclor-1242, Aroclor-1248, Aroclor-1254, and Aroclor-1260, respectively. Additionally, the revised tentative Order requires 44 PCBs congeners be monitored using U.S. EPA method 1668c. To facilitate interpretation of sediment/fish tissue data and TMDL development, PCB congeners whose analytical characteristics resemble those of PCB-8, 18, 28, 37, 44, 49, 52, 66, 70, 74, 77, 81, 87, 99, 101, 105, 110, 114, 118, 119, 123, 126, 128, 138, 149, 151, 153, 156, 157, 158, 167, 168, 169, 170, 177, 180, 183, 187, 189, 194, 195, 201,	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		206 and 209 shall be reported as a sum and individually quantified (or quantified as mixtures of isomers of a single congener in co-elutions as appropriate). Review of data submitted by the Discharger over this permit term indicates 595 sample analyses were conducted for the Aroclor compounds. All 595 sample results were reported as non-detect by the third party ELAP certified laboratory. The highly carcinogenic nature of these compounds requires that regulatory monitoring requirements will continue across the Site.	

Comment letter August 21, 2023 from Annelisa Ehret Moe, Heal the Bay; Benjamin Harris, Los Angeles Waterkeeper; Mati Waiya, Wishtoyo Chumash Foundation; and, Eugenia Ermacora, Surfrider Foundation Los Angeles

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
20	The Regional Board should require Boeing to conduct a special study to investigate whether any additional contaminants known on site are present in stormwater discharges. Only some of the many constituents of concern found onsite are addressed by the Tentative Permit. Attachment A includes a list of over 200 constituents that have been found to be present at the SSFL site, with yellow highlights indicating the constituents with effluent limitations or benchmarks under the 2022 tentative permit. While some new constituents on this list were added to the current Tentative Permit based on the results of the revised Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) incorporating monitoring data from the 2022-23 precipitation events (such as aluminum, Indeno(1,2,3-cd) pyrene, and	See response to 12a. The revised tentative Order presents the necessary requirements at this time based on an evaluation and analysis of extensive data and current site conditions. New effluent limitations for the named constituents (aluminum, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, and heptachlor) exemplify the consideration of both detection and potential to cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards that occurs during a reasonable potential analysis. The revised tentative Order continues to require substantial monitoring of pollutants in discharges of stormwater runoff from the site, including all priority pollutants, and will continue to add any new effluent limits based on the results of the monitoring data per the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Los Angeles Water Board recognizes the commenter's concern about the possible presence in stormwater of all known contaminants onsite in all media (identified in Attachment 1 of Appendix D of the 2014 SRAM). Therefore, the	Revisions made to the revised tentative Order.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	heptachlor), other constituents remain absent from the Tentative Permit despite their known presence on site. For most constituents not included in the scope of the Tentative Permit, it is circular to suggest that they are not present in stormwater discharges based on the RPA, because there has not been sufficient monitoring for those constituents in stormwater at the site to date. To ensure fulsome information about stormwater contamination, we urge the Regional Board to require Boeing to conduct a special study to analyze the possible presence of all known contaminants onsite in stormwater discharges, including but not limited to the list of constituents identified in Attachment A.	revised tentative Order contains requirements for influent monitoring of the stormwater before it is treated at the stormwater treatment systems, as well as at outfalls 008 and 009, for the remaining constituents from Attachment 1 of Appendix D of the 2014 SRAM, with updates as identified in Table 12-1 of Appendix F of the 2022 SRAM, for all media not already regularly monitored by this permit. This special monitoring will be required for the 1st and 2nd discharge events of the first year after the revised tentative Order becomes effective. Furthermore, the Discharger and NASA has submitted a PFAS investigation workplan for RFI subareas (See response to comment No. 16). Collectively the above data is expected to ensure fulsome and current information about stormwater quality at the Site.	
20a	The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") continues to identify new and improved monitoring technologies and practices, these new methodologies should be used to assess the presence of constituents currently and historically found at the site. Ruling out the possibility of a contaminant being present on the site based on outdated monitoring approaches, and therefore not monitoring for it on a regular basis, is not protective of public and environmental health. For example, some types of contaminants are grouped together in representative monitoring for one specific constituent, rather than requiring monitoring for each individual congener. The use of proxies of highly toxic and radioactive constituents for representative monitoring is insufficient to guarantee discharges are free of all constituents of concern and will not harm	The revised tentative Order requires all pollutants to be analyzed using the methods described in 40 CFR part 136. Furthermore, the revised tentative Order requires laboratories analyzing monitoring samples to be certified by the ELAP in accordance with Water Code section 13176. As USEPA promulgates any new methods, the ELAP will certify the methods for laboratories that are qualified to use the methods. The certification/accreditation processes are established pursuant to the health and Safety Code (Article 3 of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 101), and as a result samples will be analyzed by an ELAP certified lab with quality assurance and quality control data. Through this requirement, the quality of analytical data used in NPDES permitting is ensured. See also response to comment 14. In addition, for parameters with multiple congeners in a group, such as PCBs and TCDDs, the revised tentative Order explains how many individual congeners are monitored for that group. For example, Table E-3 shows TCDD as TCDD equivalents. To get the value for	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	human health or the environment. While many constituents found at the site historically may not have been detected using conventional laboratory testing methodology (including from the EPA), recent technological developments have made it possible to test for many more congeners of TCDD, PCBs, and other constituents listed in Attachment A.	TCDD equivalents, the Discharger must analyze 17 TCDD individual congeners listed in the footnote j of Table E-3.	
20b	Given that this cleanup effort has not yet begun as of 2023, it is critical that Boeing is held accountable to minimize all potential environmental impacts from the site's current state between now and the conclusion of the soil cleanup, whenever and to whatever extent that occurs. The Special Study must include monitoring and sampling for any constituents found in recent Expert Panel reports and groundwater monitoring, as well as any constituents for which the RPA utilized outdated effluent limits, monitoring procedures, and/or laboratory methodology with insufficient detection thresholds (such as PCBs and iron). There were large storm events in the 2022-2023 rain season, after which groundwater monitoring results revealed the presence of new contaminants, and existing contaminants at higher concentrations. Even if regulating groundwater contamination at this site may fall outside the scope of the Tentative Permit, the Regional Board should require sufficient monitoring to identify whether groundwater is impacted by surface water contamination, and, if so, must regulate the surface water appropriately to prevent further groundwater contamination.	The Los Angeles Water Board has considered the past industrial activity at the Site and the pollutants identified by DTSC as COPCs in surface water in establishing monitoring requirements in the permit to ensure that the pollutants sampled are representative of those that could be present in runoff leaving the site. Accordingly, the proposed monitoring and reporting requirements will result in appropriate data needed to evaluate water quality impacts of the stormwater runoff discharges and protect human health and the environment. To address the commenter's concerns, a special study has been added to the revised tentative Order. See response to comment No.20 for further response regarding the special study.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
21	The Regional Board should require Boeing to conduct toxicity testing more frequently. While we acknowledge that toxicity testing is included in the Tentative Permit, both chronic and acute toxicity testing must be done during every rain event producing a stormwater discharge from the site, and at every discharge location. Any failed toxicity results should then require Boeing to undertake a formal Toxicity Identification Evaluation to determine and address the cause. Fulsome toxicity testing will help identify additional problem areas on the site that require more attention with new BMPs and more specific monitoring for constituents of concern moving forward.	Acute toxicity testing is conducted over a short time period and measures mortality whereas chronic toxicity is conducted over a longer time period and may measure mortality, reproduction, and growth. Since chronic toxicity testing occurs over a longer time period and still measures mortality, acute toxicity can still be inferred from the chronic toxicity tests by observing the toxic effect over the course of the first few days. Monitoring data for chronic toxicity tests reported between April 2015 and March 2023 indicated two "Fail" results. One in 2017 at Discharge Point 002, and one in 2021 at Discharge Point 009. Following both failed results, the Discharger initiated the Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) process according to the Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Work Plan and reanalyzed the initial sample to establish a baseline. However, the baseline result passed with a percent effect of 9.29% in 2017 and 20.49% in 2021. Because the baseline toxicity passed, the TIE process was stopped in accordance with the approved TRE Work Plan. Subsequent samples also passed and therefore the failed results were considered episodic. Since the discharge showed reasonable potential for toxicity by having two "Fail" events, the revised tentative Order retains effluent limitations for toxicity. The revised tentative Order also contains a reopener provision to allow the Los Angeles Water Board to modify the permit in the future, if necessary, to make it consistent with any new policy, plan, law, or regulation. Toxicity testing is required at every discharge location with the first and second rain events of each calendar year. Historical data shows that the most frequent and intense rainfall occurs in the first part of the calendar year when runoff would occur. To run the chronic toxicity testing, which normally runs 7-10 days, sufficient volume of water is needed to meet the test conditions and test acceptability criteria as shown in Table E-5. Monitoring during the first and second discharge events allows for the assessment of	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		toxicity under these conditions and would be representative of the runoff from the site under less intense events. Attachment E, MRP, of the revised tentative Order section 5.7 describes TRE process and TIE implementation procedures. When toxicity testing results in "Fail", the Discharger shall follow the procedure. Since toxicity testing requirement in the revised tentative Order outlines procedures for toxicity testing for the failed test and the effects of acute toxicity can be inferred through the chronic toxicity results, the Los Angeles Water Board finds the acute toxicity testing is not necessary, and the monitoring frequency for toxicity is appropriate.	
22	The Regional Board must address possible groundwater infiltration contamination at Silvernale Pond and ensure representative influent monitoring. We continue to have grave concerns that stormwater collected onsite by Boeing's stormwater collection and treatment system is exposing toxic contamination to wildlife and leaching pollutants into the groundwater table before the water is partially treated and/or discharged from the site. Indeed, the most recent groundwater monitoring reports have detected many additional contaminants in the groundwater table, raising alarms that groundwater has been and continues to be contaminated from the SSFL site following rain events (which were notably frequent and intense during the 2022-23 wet season). We urge the Regional Board to require all unlined stormwater holding ponds onsite (including and primarily Silvernale Pond) to be lined to prevent any toxic infiltration from occurring. The Regional Board should require Boeing and/or the Expert Panel to conduct a renewed study to determine whether infiltration is occurring at Silvernale	As explained in response to comment No. 15, the groundwater expert panel stated that the pond infiltration rate is minimal. In addition, the water level in the ponds is generally kept low to provide storage for future storms. The stored stormwater is treated using advanced treatment processes prior to discharging to surface water drainages. Thus, the stored water is not contained in the ponds for long periods of time. Further, soil and groundwater remediation are integral components to the overall cleanup of SSFL, which are overseen by DTSC. As pointed out in the comment, investigation of groundwater contamination at the Site is still ongoing as part of the overall effort. The cleanup of sediment in the ponds is also overseen by DTSC and part of the overall cleanup effort. The addition of lining to the ponds could disturb the sediment at the bottom of the ponds and interfere with DTSC's cleanup efforts. ~~Thus, the Los Angeles Water Board doesn't see the necessity for a groundwater infiltration study at this point. However, as the cleanup efforts move forward, the Los Angeles Water Board will determine if an additional infiltration study is necessary.~~	~~No action taken~~ Revision made to the revised tentative Order.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	Pond. If the study shows infiltration is occurring, Silvernale Pond must be lined immediately to prevent further groundwater contamination from occurring.	However, in consideration of the commenter's concerns, an infiltration and design feasibility study has been added to the revised tentative Order, Attachment E, Section 9.4 and Attachment F, Section 7.6.3 to determine the potential for infiltration of stormwater discharges collected at Silvernale Pond and R-1 Pond to reach groundwater, and to evaluate any necessary design modifications including liner to these ponds to eliminate any potential for infiltration prior to clean up of the soils and groundwater affected by the ponds.	
22a	To ensure full accuracy of representative influent samples, the Regional Board must revise its influent monitoring protocols at Silvernale Pond to include full water column sampling from the pond, and/or sediment samples from the pond substrate. At a minimum, grab samples must be collected from the pond following every rain event, even if use of the BMP is not triggered. We are pleased to see the Regional Board include influent monitoring at the treatment system next to Silvernale Pond, which will help provide public transparency and assess the extent of contamination that may be present in the Silvernale Pond substrate (and therefore may be infiltrating into the groundwater table). However, we do not believe the methods for sampling the treatment system influent are truly representative of the extent of contamination in Silvernale Pond. As discussed with staff, influent sampling only occurs when water is exiting Silvernale Pond and entering the treatment system, which we understand to occur at the surface of the pond, and only after the pond has accumulated at least eight feet of stormwater. Because water is pumped from the surface of Silvernale Pond to the treatment system, the	The assumption that the influent sampling occurs at the surface of the pond, and only after the pond has accumulated at least eight feet of stormwater is incorrect. The operation of the stormwater treatment systems is based on several factors and a case-by-case evaluation of pending weather events, amongst other issues. Depending on anticipated rain events, operation of the stormwater treatment systems may be triggered at levels below 8 feet depending on the depth of the pond at the time of startup of the stormwater treatment system. Ultimately, the goal is to temporarily store water for treatment at a minimum depth to allow for capacity for future storms. Additionally, the intake is sampled at depth within the water column, not at the surface. The intake pipe is floating at the water surface and has a 90-degree bend that draws down a few feet below the surface. Given the design and operation of the intake structure and treatment system, pond geometry, and ongoing investigation of sediment in pond, water column testing during storm event is not feasible. Sampling shall commence after the storm has ceased and conditions allow for the safe collection of water samples in the pond.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	influent being sampled does not contain many chemicals and particulates that have already settled out of the water column and into the sediment by the time surface testing occurs.		
23	The Regional Board must include the full Reasonable Potential Analysis in the Tentative Permit for public review and transparency. Staff must confirm where the full RPA tables are located and ensure they are included in the Fact Sheet for public review before the Tentative Permit is adopted.	The Los Angeles Water Board is committed to transparency and accessibility in order to serve the public. The RPA is included as Attachment H in the revised tentative Order for public review.	No action taken.
24	The Regional Board must oversee the SSFL Permit closely and reopen the Permit to account for mobilization of contamination during Boeing's soil cleanup and following natural disasters. As we know from the devastating Woolsey Fire in 2018, these events can mobilize soil on the site and expose underlying contamination, and fires themselves can leave behind significant contamination that is directly exposed to stormwater. For this reason, following a major event like a fire or earthquake, we urge the Regional Board to consider reopening the permit to require additional monitoring and investigation of the nature of contamination onsite and to ensure there will not be elevated concentrations of constituents in stormwater discharges.	The comment is noted. The revised tentative Order includes provisions to reopen the permit to in section 6.3.1 in the Order, including mobilization of contaminants during cleanup (section 6.3.1.g) and after natural disasters (section sections 6.3.1.c and f, where monitoring shows mobilization of contaminants). In addition, the revised tentative Order includes the requirement for the Discharger to develop and submit a Climate Change Effects Vulnerability Assessment and Mitigation Plan, in light of the State's changing environment and the proactive need to address potential impacts due to climate change, such as wildfires, hurricanes and other severe weather events, on the operation of treatment system and other water quality impacts. As the soil cleanup process is moving forward, more data will be collected during and post cleanup periods. The Los Angeles Water Board will evaluate these collected data to determine the necessity of a revision to the permit and/or its monitoring and reporting program.	No action taken.

Comment Letter from August 21, 2023 from Parents Against Santa Susana Field Lab

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
25	NPDES Fails to Protect EJ Communities. There are many Environmental Justice (EJ) communities within miles of the Santa Susana Field Lab. Because of the longevity and mobility of the SSFL contaminants, residents within EJ communities in the Calleguas Creek Watershed and the Los Angeles River Watershed are at risk of exposure to the site's toxic and radioactive waste. We are especially concerned with reports of residents eating "Sewer Salmon" from the Los Angeles River who fish in the Rancho Simi Park Lake. A strong permit is necessary to protect these vulnerable communities and ensure the health and safety of the people who rely on water from the Calleguas Creek Watershed and the Los Angeles River Watershed.	The revised tentative Order contains effluent limits and other protective provisions that prevent the discharge of pollutants in amounts that would accumulate in fish and pose a threat to fish consumers, or harm recreators, or otherwise threaten the health of any community in the Los Angeles River and Calleguas Creek Watersheds. The Los Angeles Water Board is committed to Environmental Justice and has considered the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income in the development of the proposed permit. The Los Angeles Water Board also notes that with respect to the commenters' specific concerns about the fish in Rancho Simi Park Lake, the lake is in the Calleguas Creek watershed and there are no Office of Environmental Health Hazzard Assessment fish consumption advisories for the lake (https://oehha.ca.gov/fish/advisories). The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) manages and stocks trout at Rancho Simi Park Lake based on conditions in the lake (see CDFW fish planting schedule available at https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FishPlants/). CDFW are included on quarterly multi-agency coordination calls for SSFL and are included on the distribution for the revised tentative Order. Concerns with consumption of fish from Rancho Simi Park Lake may be referred to CDFW directly.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
26	Lack of Commitment to Protect SSFL Groundwater. SSFL Effluent violates the California Human Right to Water Act: Assembly Bill 685 (2012)11 which establishes that every Californian has the right to accessible, safe, clean, and affordable drinking water for the purposes of consumption, and the State is tasked with doing everything in its power to protect the Human Right to Water. The LARWQCB is violating this act by allowing Boeing to intentionally reroute dangerously contaminated surface water into the SSFL groundwater via Silvernale pond and by allowing runoff to enter the R-1 pond, both of which are unlined. Although testing influent into Silvernale and R-1 is a step in the right direction, it does not actually stop the contaminated influent from reaching the groundwater and thus potentially reaching other local groundwater and watersheds.	The Los Angeles Water Board has considered the statewide policy set forth in section 106.3 of the Water Code in the development of the revised tentative Order. In keeping with the State's specific interest in ensuring access of all Californians to drinking water of potable quality, the tentative Order requires compliance with water quality objectives set at levels that will protect beneficial uses for groundwater recharge (GWR) in applicable receiving waters. Regarding the specific concern that the Silvernale and R-1 ponds contribute to or exacerbate groundwater contamination at or in the vicinity of the Site, the Los Angeles Water Board does not agree with the characterization of the ponds as being a direct route to groundwater and/or drinking water supplies. The ponds are not designed to be percolation ponds that rely on groundwater infiltration for treatment, these ponds are short-term holding ponds for stormwater to be collected prior to treatment and discharge.~~The Los Angeles Water Board does not expect this temporarily stored stormwater to reach groundwater for the reasons discussed in responses to comments Nos.15 and 20b.~~ Nevertheless, the Los Angeles Water Board has found that uncertainty remains as to the type of pollutants in the influent to the ponds and their potential to reach groundwater. As such, the Los Angeles Water Board is requiring the Discharger to submit an infiltration and design feasibility study to evaluate potential impacts from stormwater discharges to groundwater beneath the ponds and to assess potential design modifications, such as a liner, that could be implemented at the Silvernale and R-1 ponds.	~~No action taken.~~ Revision made to the revised tentative Order.
26a	Rerouting effluent to Silvernale: Best Management Practices by Boeing consist of practices such as routing stormwater effluent to the unlined Silvernale pond. This is contrary to the LARWQCB's own statement in the 2022	See response to comments Nos. 15, 20b, 26, and 26b.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	NPDES permit, "By limiting the pollutants in SSFL discharges, the amount of pollutants entering the surface waters and groundwater basins are correspondingly reduced. Once groundwater basins are contaminated, it may take years to clean them up depending on the pollutants. Compared to surface water pollution, investigation and remediation of groundwater are often more difficult, costly, and extremely slow." This practice saves Boeing money from NPDES violations and simultaneously shifts the blame as the groundwater is managed by the DTSC, though the LARWQCB is allowing the effluent to flow into it. It leaves a giant loophole between two regulating agencies and the public is put at risk.		
26b	The permit allows Advanced Propulsion Test Facility (APTF) stormwater to infiltrate into groundwater. Water in APTF footprint, which has not been remediated, is erroneously referred to as "green space" which ignores the fact that the soil remains polluted. This area too, should be appropriately lined and monitored for leaching, or the water should be routed for filtration so that pollution isn't carried into the groundwater.	The Los Angeles Water Board has developed the revised tentative Order based on a clear recognition that cleanup of the extensive contamination resulting from the past industrial activity at SSFL has not been completed. Pollutants in the soil at the site have the potential to be eroded and carried off the site in stormwater runoff. To control these pollutants, the revised tentative Order prescribes effluent limits and other requirements to implement applicable water quality objectives that are protective of human health and the environment. The discussion in the Fact Sheet related to the Advanced Propulsion Test Facility (APTF) area is intended to explain why the tentative Order does not carry over the stormwater outfall or "discharge point" at APTF that was included in the 2016 permit. The Los Angeles Water Board disagrees that groundwater monitoring of any stormwater that may infiltrate the green spaces in the APTF, either through this permit or through separate waste discharge requirements, is needed because this area is already monitored for and being evaluated for cleanup through DTSC. The Los Angeles Water Board used the term "green space" because	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		the industrial facilities at the APTF have been demolished and the area has been revegetated with native plants. Requiring this area to be lined would result in the removal native habitat that may be acting as a biofilter for the contaminants at the Site and stabilizing sediment to minimize runoff. Currently, stormwater runoff from APTF is routinely pumped to a baker tank and transferred to the stormwater treatment system for treatment and discharge or may be shipped off site for disposal. Stormwater runoff not captured flows along a concrete ditch to R-1 Pond and Perimeter Pond for treatment and discharge. The Los Angeles Water Board supports expeditious cleanup at the Facility under the jurisdiction of DTSC, recognizing that the cleanup will address contaminants of concern in stormwater runoff leaving the site.	
27	Proposed Permit Fails to Reflect an Abundance of Caution for Climate Change and Cleanup Activities. LARWQCB wrote in its response to comments in Boeing's 2022 Proposed NPDES permit, "As excavation and other cleanup activities continue, there is the opportunity for exposing soil contamination such that stormwater could transport it off-site. Additionally, while pollutants may not have been detected in the past, with climate change and the resulting more intense storm events and increased frequency of wildfires, it is possible that there may be changes in the nature and quality of stormwater discharges. It is important that monitoring is in place to address these changes." Without explanation the following language was removed from the footnotes of 2023's Table F-12: "Climate change impacts are increasing the frequency and intensity of fires; thus, a new effluent limitation is justified where reasonable potential is triggered." The proposed removed language should remain in the permit and these two concepts should	The referenced footnote in the version of this permit that was circulated for public comment in 2022 was included based on comments relating to the addition of the post-fire data in the reasonable potential analysis summarized in Tables F-12, F-13, and F-14. The 2023 revised tentative Order incorporates all data, including post-fire data from April 2015 to March 2023; therefore, the footnote was not needed. However, for clarity, the Los Angeles Water Board agrees to include the requested text to Tables F-12, F-13 and F-14 of the revised tentative Order. The Los Angles Water Board also notes that the revised tentative Order incorporates new requirements to develop and submit a Climate Change Effects Vulnerability Assessment and Mitigation Plan (Climate Change Plan). Once the Climate Change Plan has been developed and submitted, the document will be available for public to review upon request. Expanded monitoring through additional effluent limitations and/or increased frequency of testing is not necessary as stated in response to comment No. 13.	Revision made to the revised tentative Order.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	be applied as best practices throughout the site; expanding the monitoring, effluent limitations, and frequency of testing of all historically detected constituents at all outfalls. Similarly, Boeing's Expert Panel's Climate Action Plan should be made available to the public for review and comments before being finalized.		
28	Historical Contaminants of Concern should have effluent limits in the NPDES, according to the most protective limits. 1) VOCs; 2) Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS); 3) Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHS): naphthalene, acenaphthylene, and phenanthrene; 4) Toxic Pollutants: Pesticides: Delta-BHC, 4,4'-DDT; Semivolatile Organic Compounds: 4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl ether; Inorganic Compounds: Hydrogen Cyanide; 5) Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs): Monitoring equipment that can test at more sensitive levels needs to be used and exceedance levels should be set at health protective levels. As the LARWQCB should use the best available science PCB detection, requirements should be based on method 1668c congener analysis. Limits for this constituent should be set at each outfall.	No additional effluent limitations for the contaminants of concern cited by the commenter are needed for the following reasons: 1) **VOCs** – see response to comment Nos. 12a and 20. 2) **PFAS** – see response to comment No. 16. 3) **PAHs** - there is no reasonable potential for these constituents to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard. The PAHs listed by the commenter are all already included among the 126 priority pollutants regulated by the California Toxics Rule (CTR) in 40 CFR section 131.38. Specifically, naphthalene, acenaphthylene, and phenanthrene correspond to priority pollutant numbers - #94, #57, and #99 in the CTR respectively. The CTR does not include numeric criteria for these three constituents. However, monitoring for these constituents indicated that they are not present in the stormwater. The available data is summarized as follows: acenaphthylene (48 samples, all non-detect), naphthalene (101 samples, 97 non-detect, 4 detected), phenanthrene (48 samples, all non-detect). 4) **Toxic Pollutants** - The pesticides (Delta BHC and 4,4'-DDT) listed by the commenter are also already included within the priority pollutants in the CTR (#106 and #108, respectively) and are required to be monitored and analyzed for reasonable	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		potential. For Delta-BHC, out of 49 samples, there were 3 detections at Outfall 001. All 84 samples of 4,4'-DDT were reported non-detect. Thus, these results do not indicate reasonable potential warranting an effluent limitation. 4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl is priority pollutant #72 in the CTR. Of the 48 samples, 47 were non-detect. Last on the commenters list of toxic pollutants is the inorganic compound hydrogen cyanide which is not included in the CTR. However, total cyanide is included in the required monitoring across the site and has an effluent limit already established. 5) **PCBs** - see response to comment Nos. 19 and 19a. All analyses for these pollutants were based on 40 CFR part 136 methods. Additionally, the revised tentative Order further states in Attachment E, MRP, "[f]or any pollutant whose effluent limitation is lower than all the MLs specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, the analytical method with the lowest ML must be selected.	
29	Contaminants of Concern should not be removed from any outfall. The increase in frequency and severity of unpredictable rain events and wildfires, as well as the commencement of remediation activities, can contribute to the mobilization of contaminants on site. It is therefore necessary to increase, not decrease the testing and setting of fines for constituents at all outfalls. 1) Removal of TCDD Equivalent Requirements. 2) Removal of Limits for 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine. 3) Iron should continue to be regulated at outfalls 011 and 018	Removal of effluent limitations for some constituents is appropriate and consistent with the Clean Water Act. Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 CFR section 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permits, with some exceptions, provided in CWA section 402(o)(2), where limitations may be relaxed. Section 303(d)(4)(B) also allows relaxation of limitations where the action is consistent with state's antidegradation policy. ~~Nonetheless, constituents that did not trigger RP at Outfall 008 where effluent limits were proposed to be removed were added back into the revised tentative Order because they were previously identified as needing WQBELs in~~	~~No action taken~~ Revisions were made to the revised tentative order.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		~~the previous permit. These constituents include antimony, nickel, selenium, sulfate, TCDD Equivalents, and thallium.~~ The Los Angeles Water Board conducted reasonable potential analyses based on available data and other available information including the current site conditions ~~and determined that some pollutants are eligible to have relaxed limitations. For example, TCDD TEQ did not show reasonable potential at Outfall 008 to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality criteria. However, the testing frequency of TCDD and other congeners are still required for every discharge event. This has not changed. This is discussed further in the Fact Sheet, Section 4.4.1. Anti-Backsliding Requirements~~. Both 3,3'-dichlorobenzidine and benzidine are proposed to be established as new effluent limitations at Outfalls 001, 002, 011, and 018 in the revised tentative Order. Constituents that did not trigger RP at Outfall 008 where effluent limits were proposed to be removed were added back into the revised tentative Order because they were previously identified as needing WQBELs in the previous permit. These constituents include antimony, nickel, selenium, sulfate, TCDD Equivalents, and thallium. ~~Likewise, i~~Iron monitoring will continue; however, the effluent limitation will be eliminated as discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the tentative Order. The rationale for removing the iron effluent limitation is that the iron concentrations in stormwater are associated with background soils and are not from industrial activity. Furthermore, the rationale for including an effluent limitation for iron in the prior permit for SSFL, was based solely on aesthetic qualities (or secondary MCLs), rather than health-based risks. Given that the source of the iron is background soils,	

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		continued regulation through an effluent limitation due to climate change related concerns is not warranted.	
30	Limits for Perchlorate should be health-protective. Limits are set at 6 µg/L, which complies with EPA drinking water standards. However, we would like to see limits for this particular constituent at the California Public Health Goal of 1µg/L, in efforts to adhere to the most protective health standards available. Children in the areas surrounding SSFL still play in the seeps and springs and thus there is the potential for contact and ingestion and therefore the most stringent standards should be used. There is now sufficient evidence on the health impacts of this constituent to warrant the tightening of this limit, especially considering the potential impacts to children's cognitive and intellectual development.	The Los Angeles Water Board appreciates the feedback to be mindful of perchlorate's potential impacts to children's cognitive and intellectual development and the potential impacts to all Californians. Please note that a Public Health Goal is "not a boundary line between a 'safe' and 'dangerous' level of a contaminant." (Fact Sheet for Public Health Goals for Perchlorate in Drinking Water, p. 2 available at: https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/water/chemicals/perchloratephgfactsheet.pdf). A Public Health Goal is a number intended to guide public water systems' treatment processes and is not an enforceable limit. Further, Public Health Goals are based on the level of drinking water contamination at which adverse health effects are expected to occur from a lifetime of exposure and not occasional ingestion through water contact recreation. The Los Angeles Water Board will revise the perchlorate limits based on changes to the applicable regulation. The State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water is in the process of considering revisions of the MCL for perchlorate. In 2017, the State Water Board adopted Resolution No. 2017-0041, which approved a two-step approach for the Division of Drinking Water to revise the MCL for perchlorate: (1) Establish a lower detection limit for purposes of reporting to gather information regarding perchlorate removal efficiency based on treatment technologies and other limiting factors to lower the MCL, and (2) Revise the MCL, if appropriate. Perchlorate is continually monitored at SSFL. The Order will be updated to incorporate any changes of the MCL for perchlorate if and when DDW revises it.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
31	Parents Against SSFL Opposes Fee Negotiations with Boeing. In order to ensure a full and protective cleanup of the site, we would like for fines for exceedances and other issues of non-compliance to be enforced to the fullest extent, rather than be negotiated as in the past.	Until December 31, 2021, Boeing was subject to stipulated penalties for violations of effluent limits pursuant to the 2017 Consent Judgment and the California Water Code. The Los Angeles Water Board did not agree to extend the period for imposition of stipulated penalties beyond June 30, 2022. For fines and penalties imposed for any future violations of effluent limits and permit terms, they would be assessed pursuant to the California Water Code and the State Water Resources Control Board's Water Quality Enforcement Policy.	No action taken.
32	Separate the Paired Outfalls 001/011 and Outfalls 002/018. While we understand that paired exceedances during the same event require careful analysis to avoid unwarranted duplication of fines, we would like to also avoid the elimination of fines if the concentration of effluent in the "duplicate" exceeds reasonable limits. We request, for example, that if the exceedance amount from outfalls 001 or 002 is more than double that of the exceedance at the northern paired outfalls 011 or 018, a fine be required at both of the paired outfalls. We think this is conservative and reasonable, especially as the northern outfalls are supposed to be treated prior to discharge and thus the constituent amount from the northern outfall should be filtered by that BMP process. Additional amounts of contaminants from the lower outfalls are reflective of the known contamination in the Southern buffer zone, aka, the southern undeveloped land area.	The commenter's point is noted, but there is no quantifiable support for defining a reasonable limit that would demonstrate that the water at the paired outfalls was indeed different, in order to satisfy the direction in State Board Order WQ-2006-0012.	No action taken.
33	Outfall 009 is cited as not having a filtration system in place before discharging into the Arroyo Simi. It is problematic that runoff from the former shooting range that is currently being remediated for extensive lead contamination drains	DTSC is overseeing the remediation efforts of the former shooting range in the northern drainage that discharges to Arroyo Simi. BMPs are in place in the area of excavation in the former shooting range as well as check dams in the Northern Drainage, which	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	into Outfall 009 without filtration. Lead may be mobilized in the loose soil and discharged in increased amounts due to the remediation. We would like the Water Board to address the issue to prevent increased lead exceedances in the Arroyo Simi.	provide treatment of stormwater runoff. Additionally, the culvert modifications for discharges into the Northern Drainage provides filtration of stormwater runoff. The Los Angeles Water Board does not recognize a trend of increased lead exceedances. Regardless, the revised tentative Order continues to require monitoring for lead in stormwater discharges at Outfall 009 into the Arroyo Simi and the Board will address exceedances as required should they occur.	
34	Species Sensitivity tests to happen less frequently in 2023 permit, weakening this data collection method. The 2022 proposed permit required testing in any quarter in which 15 days of rain may be expected, and the 2023 NPDES requires one screening every five years. We would like to see the previous language retained, even if that amount of rainfall is thought to be unlikely.	Toxicity testing continues to be required annually using the most sensitive species. However, as the commenter noted, the revised tentative Order requires the species sensitivity screening of the most sensitive species to be conducted once every 5 years to ensure that any changes in the discharge are still protective of the most sensitive species. Regular toxicity testing and species sensitivity screening are two different things. The species sensitive screening is to determine which of three fresh waterbody organisms, based on the organisms provided in 40 CFR 136 Table 1A, are more sensitively reacting to the Discharger's effluent. The selected organism as the most sensitive will be used for a regular toxicity testing. The reference for the 15-day requirement was based on the potential for dry weather discharges to impact wet weather runoff. Since dry weather discharges are prohibited, the 15-day test cycle was removed.	No action taken.
35	LARWQCB Transparency. Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) has made repeated requests for specific information through Public Records Act requests but has not yet received the information they've asked for. Parents believe it is vital for the LARWQCB to act in a transparent manner by releasing the information to PEER.	Please see response to comment No.17.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
36	Removal of Specific, Protective Language from 2023 Permit. Our overarching concerns about the 2023 permit pertain to the issue that a good deal of language has been removed throughout the permit, that is specific and exacting in nature, oftentimes with no replacement or with a much more generalized and weakened statement. Our concern is that this lack of explicitness, the removal of specificity across this permit only serves to weaken it, yet again, and to serve the interest of the Boeing Company and not those of the public who may be personally impacted by the loosening of this order. It must be acknowledged that this order does not exist separately from the SSFL clean up, nor from impacts to groundwater from which it attempts to distance itself but ultimately allows. It is pertinent to the issuance of this permit to acknowledge that with each renewal, the SSFL permit has been weakened; time and again the permit has lost its protectiveness.	The Los Angeles Water Board disagrees that a good deal of language has been removed. The entire document was streamlined, and sections were consolidated for efficiency and readability, often removing duplicative language. For example, during discussions with Los Angeles Water Board staff on August 17, 2023, the commenter expressed concerns regarding the removal of language under 6.1 Standard Provisions that stated: "This Order may be modified, revoked, reissued, or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR, sections 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." Staff pointed out during the call that this language was already included word for word under the Reopener Provisions, Section 6.3.1.i and therefore only removed from Section 6.1 since it was duplicative. The revised tentative Order is explicit in its requirements to address stormwater runoff from SSFL and it continues to strengthen its requirements and oversight, with this order being the most stringent to date.	No action taken.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
THE BOEING COMPANY
SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY
REVISED TENTATIVE ORDER NO. R4-2023-XXXX
NPDES NO. CA0001309

Comment Letter from August 11, 2023 from Ray Tahir, TECS Environmental

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
37	I recommend that the hearing date for the Boeing SSFL NPDES Permit be postponed for the following reasons: 1) Comment expresses that the Public Notice violates water code §13167 which requires posting of NPDES permits, waste discharge orders, and SWPPPs on its website. Nor does it comply with provisions of the Americans Disability Act (ADA). Visiting the board's downtown office to review and copy the documents in question would effectively bar those who are mobile, hearing, or sight impaired. Further, none of the associated documents was labeled "ADA-checked." 2) Comment that the ROWD incorrectly identifies the facility address as 5800 Woolsey Canyon Road, Canoga Park, Ventura County. 3) That the Discharger used two ROWDs, one sent to U.S. EPA and the other to CalEPA, but the hazardous waste box was left un-checked for CalEPA but checked for U.S. EPA. 4) The tentative NPDES permit does not specify its type. Because it does not fall under the General Industrial Activity Stormwater Permit (GIASP), it must be an individual permit. Clearly, the Boeing permit is unique and it should clearly state it is an individual NPDES permit. 5) The tentative permit also shows the same address as the CalEPA ROWD, which may be incorrect because it shows Ventura County instead of Los Angeles County. 6) The tentative Boeing NPDES permit calls for Boeing to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) 90 days from the date of permit adoption, without the benefit of public review and comment. This fails to comply with water code §13263.3. Therefore, the tentative permit must be postponed and revised to eliminate the 90 day no public	The Los Angeles Water Board disagrees with delaying hearing on this matter for the reasons cited by the commenter. Further delays will impact compliance measures established in this order for stormwater runoff from SSFL. Each argument is addressed below: 1) Posting and Accessibility – The Los Angeles Water Board complied with the applicable law for noticing and posting this permit, including accessibility requirements. A public notice was posted along with pertinent accompanying documents on the Los Angeles Waterboard website to support the review of the revised tentative Order as required by Water Code section 13167.5 and the 40 CFR 124.10(c)(2)(iv). All documents that were posted met accessibility requirements including all Priority 1, 2, and 3 guidelines, for "AA" compliance of the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0, as well as Section 508, Subpart B, Subsection 1194.22, Guidelines A-P of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as revised in 1998. The SWPPP and the ROWD are not circulated for public review and comment because they are developed pursuant to the permit but do not contain or constitute permit terms in and of themselves. Further, Water Code 13167(a) requires the State Board, with the assistance of the regional boards, to place and maintain on its website, "information on water quality monitoring, assessment, research, standards, regulation, enforcement and other pertinent matters." Water Code 13267(b) requires that the "information" required by section 13167(a) include "copies of permits" and "waste discharge requirements." Again, the SWPPP and the	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	review SWPPP submittal requirement. 7) The 2019 SWPPP does not reflect requirements contained in the Boeing-DTSC settlement dated May 9, 2023, that could require additional best management practices (BMPs). 8) The absence of a Geiger counter to identify radioactive areas that require excavation and removal; failure to identify where the radioactive soil would be taken for disposal; and placement of Geiger counter inside the Boeing SSFL gatehouse to monitor outbound traffic for loads containing radioactive material.	ROWD are not themselves permits, therefore, the ROWD and SWPPP are not required to be maintained on the Los Angeles Water Board website per the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Nevertheless, the ROWD and SWPPP are public records and even if these documents are not available online, they are available upon request from the Los Angeles Water Board. (The Los Angeles Water Board notes that these documents were specifically made available to the requester on July 27, 2023). Where documents are electronic, these documents will be provided digitally through email, file transfer portal (FTP) or other electronic means. Alternatively, a requester may choose to come into the office to view and/or copy the document. The Los Angeles Water Board recognizes the public interest's in SSFL and documents associated with the Los Angeles Water Board's oversight of this facility. The Los Angeles Water Board is working on addressing the posting of documents developed by others that may not meet accessibility standards and will provide updates once available. Until then, we will continue to provide copies electronically upon request. 2-5) Comments on the ROWD - The ROWD provides the correct address for the facility and is consistent with the address provided in the revised tentative Order. The facility is located on the border of Los Angeles and Ventura County; however, the address lists it as Canoga Park as that is the service area for the U.S. Postal Service to the Facility. An ROWD application package includes both state and federal forms based on the industry and type of discharge. Each form requests different information related to the nature of the discharge and facility information. The ROWD was reviewed by staff and the	

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		application deemed complete on October 29, 2019. The revised tentative Order is an individual permit. If it was to be considered as a General Permit, it would have reference to the IGP Order No. in the heading. 6-7) Comments on the SWPPP - the Facility currently has a SWPPP in place, which is routinely updated to reflect current conditions at the Facility and is required to update the SWPPP within 90 days of the permit effective date. This ensures that the Discharger incorporates the requirements of the newly adopted permit into the updated SWPPP as necessary. The 2019 SWPPP does not address the Boeing-DTSC settlement as those came after the development of the SWPPP, which was submitted with the ROWD that was submitted in 2019. SWPPPs are not required to be circulated for public comment. (40 CFR section 124.10(c)(2)(iv)(requiring 30-day public notice of the draft permit and fact sheet for major NPDES permits) Water Code 13167.5 (requiring circulation of draft WDRs for 30 day public comment period).) 8) Comments on the use of a Geiger counter. The comment appears to reference soil remediation. Excavation and soil removal are part of the soil cleanup activities under the direction of DTSC. Geiger counters are used for those clearance activities and any questions or comments related to those should be directed to DTSC.	

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
THE BOEING COMPANY
SANTA SUSANA FIELD LABORATORY
REVISED TENTATIVE ORDER NO. R4-2023-XXXX
NPDES NO. CA0001309

Email Comments from August 21, 2023 from Marie Mason

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
38	I have been working since 1989 to see that this site is cleaned up to protect the residents that live below this highly contaminated site. It seems that the Boeing Company just keeps getting away with doing almost nothing to clean up this site. Millions of our tax dollars have been spent on this site and in the end, Boeing just gets their way with every agency they have to deal with. Your agency should be looking out for the community to give all the families below this site a slight sign that you care about us not the Boeing Company. The NPDES should never allow this highly contaminated surface water to go to an unlined Silvernale Pond which already is full of contaminates to just add more to drain to the groundwater and on to our communities. The LAWQCB went against the publics pleas to not pass the MOU last year but it fell on deaf ears and went along with the secret meeting deal that Boeing and the State came up with I have been writing letters for over 30 years and I'm still waiting for the state agencies to do the right thing. Your agency can now demand the Boeing Company to do the full clean up that we have been promised, until this site is cleaned up to the 2007 and 2010 agreements the contamination on this site will continue to flow to the families below.	The revised tentative Order incorporates effluent limitations that are protective of human health and the environment. Refer to responses to comment No. 15, regarding ponds; and No.12a and No. 20b regarding regulation of pollutants and DTSC soil cleanup-up. Soil cleanup is not within the scope of the subject revised tentative NPDES Order; however, the Los Angeles Water Board agrees that cleanup of the site under DTSC has taken far too long. The MOU between the Discharger, and the Los Angeles Water Board, adopted on August 11, 2022, provides a comprehensive framework that, in conjunction with the Settlement Agreement between Boeing and DTSC, establishes strict cleanup protocols and streamlines timelines for the remediation at SSFL. Nothing in the MOU affects Boeing's compliance obligations under the tentative Order. The MOU sets forth the procedures and conditions that Boeing must satisfy before the Los Angeles Water Board will consider relieving Boeing of its NPDES permit obligations. Under the Clean Water Act, a permit for a site like this one, at which industrial activity used to occur but is no longer occurring, may be terminated after the Los Angeles Water Board determines there are no longer any significant materials from past industrial activity that may impact stormwater. The MOU establishes standards to ensure that an NPDES permit will remain in effect until stormwater data from the Boeing areas clearly indicate that significant materials are not contributing to stormwater pollution, and that animals and human health are protected for the long term. Additionally, the MOU is also designed to ensure that Boeing will remain subject to the Los Angeles Water Board's regulatory oversight for stormwater discharges from the site unless and until	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
		Boeing's areas of responsibility are cleaned up and DOE and/or NASA have NPDES permit coverage for the site.	

Email Comments from August 21, 2023 from William Preston Bowling and Ruth Luevanos

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
39	1) Boeing's proposed NPDES should be regulating all Constituents of Concern that have been historically detected at the Santa Susana Field Lab, at every outfall, for every rain event. Especially with the impacts of climate change, the NPDES should be the most protective possible. 2) The NPDES should not allow contaminated surface water to be routed to Silvernale Pond. It's an unlined pond and has the potential to allow contaminants to reach local watersheds that are used for drinking water, crop irrigation, wildlife, and recreation, and that reach the Pacific Ocean. 3) The NPDES permit should monitor for and regulate Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and Per-and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PAHS). 4) Although the fee negotiations period has ended with Boeing for NPDES violations, residents want to ensure that new fee negotiations are not taken up. Boeing should be held completely responsible for every violation.	1) Comment regarding the regulation of all constituents of concern - Please see response to comments 12a and 20. 2) Comment regarding discharges to Silvernale Pond – Please see response to comments 13 and 22. 3) Comment regarding the regulation of VOCs and PAHs please see response to comments 12a, 20, and 28. 4) Comment regarding fee negotiations – Please see response to comment 15. 5) Comment regarding paired violations – Please see response to comments 18 and 32. 6) Comment on the MOU – Please see response to comment No. 38.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	5) Paired Outfalls 001/011 and Outfalls 002/018 should be able to incur separate MCL violations if there is a significant difference in values between the upper and lower outfalls. 6) The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) let residents down by passing the Memorandum on Understanding (MOU) last year, despite the public's overwhelming disapproval. We now ask the LARWQCB to ensure the safest NPDES possible and to demand the full and complete cleanup of the SSFL, per the original 2007 and 2010 agreements. The contamination in the SSFL rainwater runoff will only stop once the site is completely remediated.		

Email Comments from August 21, 2023 from Carmi Orenstein

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
40	1) I attended (in person) the Board's 2022 meeting in which the Board—in direct opposition to the majority opinion expressed at the meeting—passed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining a process by which Boeing would eventually be exempted from the surface water pollutant permitting system that the Board oversees. As you know, this MOU represented the final approval needed for a larger deal between the	1) Regarding comments on the MOU – please see response to comment No. 38. 2) Regarding comments on changes to stormwater character due to climate change – please refer to responses to comment Nos. 4 and 24.	No action taken.

No.	Comment Summary	Response	Action Taken
	state and Boeing to take effect. That larger deal allows Boeing to leave much of the contamination in place at SSFL. The MOU assumes that stormwater runoff from Boeing areas will eventually no longer be polluted, and thus in no need of regulation. How can the Board be confident of this? 2) As evidenced by Hurricane Hilary's impact on the Los Angeles area these past days, stormwater will become increasingly unpredictable and erratic, with likely larger runoff events. Permitting must take this into account. 3) In light of this overall situation, I appeal to the Board that Boeing's renewed NPDES permit should include all Constituents of Concern that have been historically detected at SSFL, at every outfall, for every rain event. The permit should monitor for and regulate volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). Further, Boeing should be held completely responsible for every violation it commits. 4) The Board must ensure the most inclusive and protective permit possible and use its position to advocate for the full and complete cleanup of SSFL, as outlined in the original 2007 and 2010 legally-binding agreements. The contamination present in SSFL stormwater runoff will only cease once the site is completely remediated, an outcome that Boeing certainly will not see to, left to its own devices.	3) Regarding comments on constituents of concern, including VOCs and PFAS – please see response to comment No. 12a, 20, and 28. 4) Regarding the level of cleanup at SSFL – The Los Angeles Water Board supports expeditious cleanup at the Facility under the jurisdiction of DTSC, recognizing that the cleanup will address contaminants of concern in stormwater runoff leaving the site. The Los Angeles Water Board has developed the revised tentative Order based on a clear recognition that cleanup of the extensive contamination resulting from the past industrial activity at SSFL has not been completed. Pollutants in the soil at the site have the potential to be eroded and carried off the site in stormwater runoff. To control these pollutants, the revised tentative Order prescribes effluent limits and other requirements to implement applicable water quality objectives that are protective of human health and the environment.	