RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
HAYNES TANK FARM
TENTATIVE ORDER R4-2018-XXXX
NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0057649

Comment Letter dated February 26, 2018, from Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (Discharger)			
No.	**Comment**	**Response**	**Action Taken**
0	Throughout the permit the use of "oil/water separator" and "skim pond" appear to be used interchangeably. LADWP suggests for consistency and since the wording "skim pond" is used on the schematic that the permit uses the term "skim pond" throughout the permit. LADWP requests the term "oil/water separator" be replaced with "skim pond" throughout the permit for consistency.	The comment correctly notes that the terms have been used interchangeably throughout the permit. The request to replace the term "oil/water separator" with "skim pond" throughout the permit for consistency is appropriate and the permit has been edited accordingly.	"Oil/water separator" replaced with "skim pond" throughout the permit.
1	**Section IV: Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications, page 5 &6** The toxicity testing requirements have been modified to include the chronic toxicity testing. Due to the fact that there has not been much rain fall and in the past when there had been rainfall the acute toxicity was in compliance with the permit. LADWP questions the need for the chronic toxicity requirement. Therefore, LADWP requests that the testing requirement remains the same as the previous permit, include only the acute toxicity requirement, and remove the chronic toxicity requirement.	Section IV.C.6 of Attachment F (page F-20) states: *Chronic toxicity is a more stringent requirement than acute toxicity. A chemical at a low concentration can have chronic effects but no acute effects. <u>This Order replaces the acute toxicity limitation in Order No. R4-2011-0191 with a chronic toxicity limitation</u>. The chronic toxicity limitation addresses both acute and chronic toxicity in the discharge.* The use of the chronic toxicity test rather than acute toxicity provides information on mortality (the acute toxicity endpoint) and reductions in growth and reproduction (chronic toxicity endpoints). The implementation of the chronic toxicity test in lieu of the acute test is consistent with what the Regional Board has been requiring of other similar dischargers in the region for over three years.	None taken.

Comment Letter dated February 26, 2018, from Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (Discharger)			
No.	**Comment**	**Response**	**Action Taken**
2	**Section IV: Item C.1.Reopener Provisions, page 11** The provisions "e" and "g" of the Reopener Provisions are identical. LADWP requests that one of these be removed.	Provision IV.C.1.g will be deleted as requested.	Provision IV.C.1.g (page 11) deleted.
3	**Section VI: Section C Special Provisions. Item 2.b Harbor Toxics TMDL Water Column and Sediment Monitoring for Responsible in the San Gabriel River, page 12 and Section IX. Paragraph D., page E-16-17.** Haynes Generating Station has not had a storm water discharge associated with this permit since 2005. Having not contributed storm water discharges over an approximate 13 year period, LADWP would like this provision removed from the tentative permit. Since there has not been a discharge, LADWP does not believe that the Haynes Tank Farm is contributing pollutants to the water column or sediment. In addition, LADWP is concerned with the wet weather sampling, to obtain such samples during a wet weather event from the mouth of the San Gabriel River would put personnel in an unsafe situation due to the high flows of the river during the storm event and the need to grab sediment samples from the middle of the river during these high flows.	As indicated in the comment, the tentative requirements implement Harbor Toxics monitoring requirements for responsible parties in the San Gabriel River. The Discharger is a "responsible party" because it is an "Individual Industrial Permittee" as identified in the San Gabriel River Metals TMDL. As such, either individually or with a collaborating group, the Discharger shall develop a Monitoring Plan. The Discharger may elect to meet this requirement by joining a collaborating group in the watershed. If the Discharger plans to develop a site specific plan, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Board within 90 days of the Order effective date and submit the plan for comment and/or approval as instructed in section VI.C.2.b. Since historically the Haynes Tank Farm has discharged infrequently, you may choose to develop a site specific plan.	None taken.
4	**Attachment C – Flow Schematic, page C-1** As mentioned above, the Haynes Tank Farm has gone through significant modifications in the last five years. LADWP has enclosed the most current Wastewater Flow Schematic (Enclosure 1) to be substituted for that included in the revised permit. Tank A is currently being used for the storage of No. 2 diesel fuel. Tanks D and E are	Staff made minor edits to Section II.A of Attachment F to reflect the clarifications provided in the comment. Attachment C is replaced with the updated flow schematic provided with the comments as requested.	Minor edits to Section II.A of Attachment F (page F-3). Replaced Attachment C

Comment Letter dated February 26, 2018, from Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (Discharger)			
No.	**Comment**	**Response**	**Action Taken**
	empty and clean. Tanks A-D are enclosed by a compacted earthen berm. The berm was constructed when Tanks A-D were used to store diesel fuel, to provide secondary containment in the event of an oil spill. Tank E is enclosed by a compacted earthen berm. The berm was constructed when Tank E was used to store diesel fuel, to provide secondary containment in the event of a spill Tanks B & C are being used as settling tanks that store storm water that has been collected in the bermed containment areas around Tanks A-D and Tank E, respectively. The storm water settles and is then released to percolate/evaporate in the containment area for Tanks A-D.		with updated flow schematic.
5	**Attachment E, Section II Monitoring Locations, Table E-1, page E-5** The revised tentative Permit has a second receiving water monitoring location (RSW-002). This facility stopped storm water discharges in part because the receiving water (Los Alamitos Channel) cannot be safely accessed. The banks of the channel are steep and eroded in many areas. Due to the inability to safely access monitoring RSW-002, LADWP requests that only RSW-001 be required for sampling.	The permit includes a downstream receiving water monitoring location of RSW-002. If a location 50 feet downstream is not available the next closest safely accessible location is acceptable. The data collected at this location will be used to evaluate the effects of discharges on the water quality of the receiving water. If the Discharger is unable to identify a safely accessible location, this determination must be documented in the Self-Monitoring Report with findings and/or photos associated with the inspections of the area. Staff will include a footnote to Tables E-1 and E-5 to document the clarification.	Footnote added to Table E-1 (page E-5) and Table E-5 (page E-15).
6	**Attachment E, Section II. Effluent Monitoring Requirements, Tables E-2 -- E-5, pages E-6 -- E-13** It has been noted, similar to the last renewal, effluent limits for several constituents have been added to this permit. LADWP believes that some of these (benzene, MTBE, xylene, and ethylbenzene) may have been added due to LADWP's erroneous re-classification of this facility as SIC 5171 (petroleum bulk station and terminal). LADWP's tank farm	The permit does not include effluent limitations for benzene, MTBE, xylene and ethylbenzene. The permit does include monitoring requirements for these pollutants. These pollutants are associated with petroleum type products. A number of the tanks have historically been used for the storage of fuel and per recent information submitted, Tank 2 is	None taken.

Comment Letter dated February 26, 2018, from Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (Discharger)			
No.	**Comment**	**Response**	**Action Taken**
	is not a petroleum bulk station and terminal, these areas are part of the steam electric generating station, which is SIC 4911. If benzene, MTBE, xylene, and ethylbenzene were in fact added as a result of the SIC 5171 classification, LADWP requests that these constituents be deleted.	currently being used to store diesel fuel. Therefore, staff has included requirements to monitor these pollutants at both EFF-001 and EFF-002.	
7	**Attachment E, Section X.B -- Table E-6 Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule, page E-18** LADWP requests that the due dates of the reports be changed to the 15th day of each of the following months (May, August, November, and February) rather than the first day of the month. This would allow sufficient time to conclude all relevant data for each report.	Due dates will be changed to the 15th of the month in Table E-6 as requested.	Due dates changed in Table E-6 (page E-18).
8	**Attachment F, Standard Industrial Code (SIC), Table F-1 Facility Information, page F-2** Only Tank A at this facility contains fuel, and that is diesel No. 2 (distillate) which would be used for emergency start-ups. Therefore, LADWP requests that the SIC be changed from SIC 5171 (petroleum bulk station and terminal) to SIC 4911 (Industrial, minor) throughout the permit. LADWP also requests that "threat to water quality" be reduced from category 3 to category 2.	SIC 5171 is defined as: "Establishments primarily engaged in the wholesale distribution of crude petroleum and petroleum products, including liquefied petroleum gas, from bulk liquid storage facilities." The comment correctly notes that this does not describe current operations at the facility, therefore, the SIC in Table F-1 (page F-2) will be changed to 4911 as requested. Table 4-1 of the Basin Plan (page 4-6) defines "Threat to Water Quality" categories as follows: Category I (1): Major threat Category II (2): Moderate threat Category III (3): Minor threat The tentative order identifies the facility as Category 3 (minor threat). This is the lowest "Threat to Water Quality" category, therefore the requested change is not necessary.	SIC changed to 4911 in Table F-1 (page F-2).

Comment Email dated February 23, 2018, from Los Angeles WaterKeeper			
No.	**Comment**	**Response**	**Action Taken**
1	We are supportive of the switch from an acute toxicity limitation to a chronic toxicity limitation.	Comment noted.	None taken.
2	We notice on p. F-24 that the effluent limitation for zinc is 388 micrograms per liter, and reference is made to the CTR standard (as well as the previous order and the SIP) for justification. Since the CTR uses a CMC of 120 micrograms per liter (and we use this CTR value when negotiating Consent Decrees), we were a bit unclear as to how the effluent limitation of 388 micrograms per liter is derived.	California Toxics Rule (CTR) criteria for zinc is hardness dependent, based on the hardness of the receiving water. The CTR criteria maximum concentration (CMC) of 120 µg/L was calculated using a hardness of 100 mg/L $CaCO_3$, the default hardness value used to calculate all hardness dependent CTR criteria. The last available hardness value for the receiving water was 400 mg/L $CaCO_3$. Using that value, the effluent limitation for zinc was calculated to be 388 µg/L. The 388 µg/L effluent limitation for zinc was also included in Order No. R4-2011-0191. Since no discharges have occurred, staff has no data to evaluate hardness or update the effluent limitation. When there is another discharge, the discharger will be required to monitoring the receiving water for hardness and the updated values will be used to calculate the effluent limitations using the most recent hardness data.	None taken.