

Response to Comments

City of Los Angeles
 Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant
 Tentative NPDES Permit

This Table describes all significant comments received from interested persons with regard to the above-mentioned tentative permit. Each comment has a corresponding response and action taken.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
Comments received from City of Los Angeles on February 6, 2017				
City of Los Angeles	1	Order, Table 2 <u>Discharge Point No. Designation and coordinates</u> 1. DCTWRP has four Discharge Point Names (001, 002, 003, and 008). The new designation Discharge Point No. 001 listed in Table 2 might be confused with the old and inactive Discharge Point Name 001. Discharge Point Name 001 is a legacy designation for the original outfall at the LA River. LASAN requests that Discharge Point No. 001 be changed to Discharge Point No. 001A 2. Table 2 contains incorrect coordinates. LASAN requests to change the coordinates to: Latitude (North) 34.18025, Longitude (West) -118.48028	DCTWRP has four Outfall Structures as defined on page F-7. The Discharge Point is EFF-001. Table 2 has been updated to correct the Discharge Point No. and the latitude and longitude were replaced, as requested.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	2	Order, Document Header <u>Consistent document header</u> The Header in the Table of Contents is not consistent with the rest of the document. LASAN recommends changing and using the Header: " <i>Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant</i> " in the	All document headers were edited to read " <i>Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant</i> " throughout the entire document.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		entire document.		
City of Los Angeles	3	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 5</p> <p><u>Retain Turbidity narrative language</u></p> <p>The tentative permit removed the narrative language on turbidity when it was placed in Table 4.</p> <p>LASAN requests to place a reference footnote on Turbidity and retain the narrative language as the footnote:</p> <p><i>“For the protection of the water contact recreation beneficial use, the wastes discharged to water courses shall have received adequate treatment, so that the turbidity of the wastewater does not exceed any of the following: (a) an average of 2 Nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs) within a 24-hour period; (b) 5 NTUs more than 5 percent of the time (72minutes) within a 24-hour period; and (c) 10 NTU at any time.”</i></p>	The change was made, as requested, to include the mentioned footnote in Table 4.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	4	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 5</p> <p><u>Retain Temperature narrative language</u></p> <p>The tentative permit removed the narrative language on temperature when it was placed in Table 4.</p> <p>LASAN requests to place a footnote on Temperature and retain the narrative language as the footnote:</p> <p><i>“The temperature of wastes discharged shall not exceed 86 F except as a result of external ambient temperature.”</i></p>	The change was made, as requested, to include the mentioned footnote in Table 4.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	5	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 6</p> <p><u>Radioactivity annual average</u></p>	Federal NPDES regulations contained in 40 CFR part 122.45 states that all permit limitations, standards, and prohibitions, including those to achieve water quality	None necessary.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>According to the tentative permit, radioactivity limits are “specified in Title 22, chapter 15, article 5, sections 64442 and 64443, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), or subsequent revisions”.</p> <p>Accordingly, compliance with radioactivity should be based on running annual average or annual average.</p> <p>LASAN requests that radioactivity limits be changed from monthly average to annual average.</p>	<p>standards, shall unless impracticable be stated as maximum daily and average monthly discharge limitations for all Permittees other than POTWs.</p> <p>In addition, the Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxic Control (TSD) does not recommend that effluent limitations be expressed as yearly averages. The convention is daily maximums and monthly averages. The Basin Plan, which lists some of the MCLs, does not contain any implementation instructions directing staff to apply the MCLs as yearly maximums, therefore the effluent limitations will remain as monthly averages.</p>	
City of Los Angeles	6	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 6, Footnote 4</p> <p><u>Typo error in Footnote 4</u></p> <p>Footnote 4 refers to the wrong treatment plant.</p> <p>LASAN requests to correct “The WLAs for LAGWRP <u>DCTWRP</u> is set equal to a ...”</p>	The typo was corrected to read DCTWRP.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	7	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 7-8</p> <p><u>Formatting Footnotes 9,10,11, and 12, 13</u></p> <p>LASAN requests that there should be a comma between reference footnotes.</p> <p>LASAN requests the following correction: Cadmium (wet weather)^{9,10,11}, should be ^{9,10,11}. Copper (year round)^{9,10,11}, should be as ^{9,10,11}; Lead (year round)^{9,10,11}, should be ^{9,10,11}. Chronic Toxicity^{12,13} should be ^{12,13}</p>	All referenced footnotes were corrected, accordingly.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	8	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 7</p> <p><u>Footnote 10 not applicable to copper and lead</u></p> <p>Footnote 10 applies to wet-weather limits and does not</p>	The referenced footnote for copper and lead were removed, accordingly.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>apply to copper and lead since their limits are year round.</p> <p>LASAN requests to remove footnote 10 on copper and lead in Table 4.</p>		
City of Los Angeles	9	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 7</p> <p><u>Effluent limits for metals reduced</u></p> <p>Cadmium, lead, and selenium effluent limits have decreased significantly compared to the 2011 permit.</p> <p>LASAN requests to review the basis for the calculations of these limits.</p>	<p>Regional Water Board staff checked the effluent limitation calculations for cadmium, copper, lead and selenium. The lead calculation was revised to correctly apply the chronic criteria (CCC) and a problem with the calculation of the selenium data set characteristics was also corrected. The changes are as follows.</p> <p>Cadmium: no change in recalculated limits Copper: no change in recalculated limits</p> <p>Lead: 5.3 µg/L to 8.4 µg/L, as monthly average 10 µg/L to 16 µg/L, as daily maximum</p> <p>Selenium: 2.2 µg/L to 3.9 µg/L, as monthly average 5 µg/L to 8.7 µg/L, as daily maximum</p>	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	10	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Page 7</p> <p><u>Footnote 10 description</u></p> <p>USGS Station 11087020 is located in the San Gabriel River at Whittier Narrows. LASAN requests to correct footnote 10 and remove USGS Station 11087020 and add monitoring location name to:</p> <p><i>"This effluent limitation does not apply during dry-weather when the maximum daily flow measured at <u>Receiving Water Monitoring Location RSW-003D (also known as Los Angeles Department of Public Works' Wardlow Gage Station No. F319-R)</u> USGS Station 11087020 is less than 500 cubic feet per second."</i></p>	The referenced footnote was edited to incorporate suggested language, accordingly.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
City of Los Angeles	11	<p>Order, Section IV.A.1.a, Table 4, Page 8</p> <p><u>Heptachlor spelling</u></p> <p>LASAN requests to correct the spelling from “heptaclor” to “heptachlor” throughout the document.</p>	The typos were corrected.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	12	<p>Order, Section V.A.19, Page 10</p> <p><u>Chronic toxicity in receiving waters</u></p> <p>LASAN noticed that some of the language contained in the previous permit has been moved around, including the language on “Chronic Toxicity Narrative Receiving Water Quality Objective”.</p> <p>LASAN requests that the paragraphs “c” and “d” from the previous 2011 permit be added back into the 2017 tentative permit:</p> <p><i>c. If the chronic toxicity median monthly threshold in the receiving water at the monitoring station(s) immediately downstream of the discharge is not met and the toxicity cannot be attributed to upstream toxicity, as assessed by the Permittee, then the Permittee shall initiate accelerated monitoring.</i></p> <p><i>d. If the chronic toxicity median monthly threshold of the receiving water at upstream and downstream stations is not met, but the effluent chronic toxicity median monthly effluent limitation was met, then accelerated monitoring need not be implemented.</i></p>	The noted language is provided on page E-9 of the MRP as footnote #26. For clarity, staff agrees to include that same language on page 9 of the tentative Order, section V.A.19 - Chronic Toxicity Narrative Receiving Water Quality Objective and will appear as sections “c” and “d.”	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	13	<p>Order, Section VI.A.2.z, Page 13</p> <p><u>Requirement to submit feasibility study on water recycling</u></p> <p>The tentative permit requires permittee to “investigate the feasibility of additional recycling, efforts to reduce the amount of treated effluent discharged via this</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board does not agree that the feasibility study should be a recommendation, rather than a requirement of the order. The study requirements are consistent with state policy regarding recycled water. Staff has proposed some revisions to the proposed language.</p> <p>Order, Section VI.A.2.z has been revised as follows:</p>	Some revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p><i>NPDES Order...the permittee shall submit this feasibility study as part of the submittal of the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) for the next permit renewal."</i></p> <p>LASAN supports water recycling projects in all of its treatment plants. However, LASAN requests that the feasibility study on water recycling should not be mandatory as a requirement, but should just be recommendatory.</p>	<p>"State Water Board Resolution 2009-0011, Adoption of a Policy for Water Quality Control for Recycled Water (Revised January 22, 2013, effective April 25, 2013), directs the Regional Water Board to encourage recycling. Consistent with the Policy, the Permittee shall submit a feasibility report evaluating the feasibility of additional recycling efforts to reduce the amount of treated effluent discharged as authorized in this Order and a recycled water progress report describing any updates to the development of increased water production and/or distribution. These reports shall be included in the annual report submittal, as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP)."</p>	
City of Los Angeles	14	<p>Order, Section VI.C.1.n, Page 15</p> <p><u>Reopener clause</u></p> <p>The tentative permit characterizes the ammonia and copper limits as water quality based effluent limits (WQBELs) even though these limits are not based on water quality objectives and are solely based on performance. Thus, these are more appropriately characterized as performance based effluent limits (PBELs).</p> <p>Although the City may be able to meet the proposed PBELs currently, the concern is that this will not be true in the future. While the City appreciates the addition of a reopener, this reopener will not protect the City from MMPs should the PBEL be exceeded for reasons beyond its control. Further, the City wants to make sure that there are no future backsliding issues related to these performance-based limits should performance differ in the future.</p> <p>To address these concerns, the LASAN requests the following minor changes be made to the reopener provisions of the permit and fact sheet.</p> <p><i>"This NPDES permit may be reopened for modification</i></p>	<p>When drafting a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, a permit writer must consider the impact of the proposed discharge on the quality of the receiving water. Water quality goals for a waterbody are defined by state water quality standards. By analyzing the effect of a discharge on the receiving water, a permit writer could find that technology-based effluent limitations (TBELs) alone will not achieve the applicable water quality standards. In such cases, the Clean Water Act (CWA) and its implementing regulations require development of water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs). WQBELs help meet the CWA objective of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters and the goal of water quality that provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water (fishable/swimmable). WQBELs are designed to protect water quality by ensuring that water quality standards are met in the receiving water.</p> <p>The proposed effluent limitations for copper and ammonia are not TBELs. In that regard, the calculated effluent limitations for copper and ammonia are considered WQBELs because they are intended and designed to protect water quality by ensuring that water quality standards are met in the receiving water. Therefore, the "water quality based" cannot be removed in that sentence.</p>	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p><i>to recalculate the final water quality based effluent limitations for Ammonia as Nitrogen and/or Copper, to incorporate a revised margin of safety factor reflective of plant performance consistent with and up to the maximum limits allowed by the applicable TMDLs and SSOs, if the discharger provides new information to the Regional Board showing the flow conditions or other extenuating circumstances cause a significant change in the water reclamation plant's treatment performance."</i></p>	<p>However, the proposed additional language in the paragraph will be inserted as stated in your comment.</p>	
City of Los Angeles	15	<p>Order, Section VI.C.6.b.i, Page 20</p> <p><u>Coliform analysis during spills</u></p> <p>For spills that reach marine waters, the tentative permit states "<i>that the Permittee shall analyze for total coliform, fecal coliform and enterococcus</i>".</p> <p>The US EPA's 2012 recommendations are to use enterococci as a sole indicator of REC 1 contact standards, due to numerous studies which have shown that enterococcus are the most accurate and protective of human health in marine waters. The State Water Resources Control Board also recommends that enterococci should be used as the sole indicator in marine waters. The use of total coliform and fecal coliform to assess the risk to human health in marine waters is not supported by US EPA studies and is therefore un-necessary and not as protective of human health as enterococci testing.</p> <p>Therefore, LASAN requests to remove total coliform and fecal coliform and retain only the analysis of enterococcus.</p>	<p>"The 2015 Ocean Plan, adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board), established bacterial objectives for ocean waters used for water-contact recreation. These bacterial objectives are identical to the bacteriological standards adopted by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) for coastal waters adjacent to public beaches and public water contact sports areas in ocean waters. The State Board and CDPH objectives provide standards for three different bacteriological indicators, namely total coliform, fecal coliform and enterococcus density. Therefore, all three indicators must be monitored following a spill that reaches marine waters to ensure protection of human health for recreational activities in ocean waters. Consequently, the monitoring requirement for marine waters will remain as stated in the tentative permit."</p>	None necessary.
City of Los Angeles	16	<p>Attachment B, Page B-1</p> <p><u>Location of RSW614</u></p>	<p>The aforementioned map was replaced.</p>	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>The location of RSW614 is not correct in the map. RSW614 correct location is just south of Victory Blvd.</p> <p>LASAN will correct the map and submit it to the Regional Water Board.</p>		
City of Los Angeles	17	<p>Attachment E, Section I.H, Page E-3</p> <p><u>ML, RL</u></p> <p>The tentative permit states that <i>“When there is deviation from the method analytical procedures, such as dilution or concentration of samples, other factors may be applied to the ML depending on the sample preparation. The resulting value is the reported ML.”</i></p> <p>The MDL and RL are the values required to be reported - as stated in the first sentence. Then it goes on to tell how to compute the RL. The resulting value is the RL.</p> <p>LASAN requests that the last sentence be changed to: <i>“The resulting value is the reported ML <u>RL</u>.”</i></p>	The requested language changing the “ML” to “RL” will be reflected in the revised tentative permit.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	18	<p>Attachment E, Section II, Table E-1, Page E-5</p> <p><u>EFF-001A coordinates</u></p> <p>Table E-1 contains incorrect coordinates for EFF-001A.</p> <p>LASAN requests to change the coordinates to: Latitude (North) 34.18025, Longitude (West) -118.48028</p>	The coordinates were replaced with updated information.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	19	<p>Attachment E, Section II, Table E-1, Page E-5</p> <p><u>Consistency in receiving water location naming convention</u></p>	The designation for naming the receiving water stations will keep the nomenclature used in the current permit, and consistent with the regional watershed monitoring program. For example, the revised monitoring location name will read RSW-LATT612.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>The previous naming convention of RSW-LATT has been changed and shortened to just RSW in this tentative permit compared to the 2011 DCTWRP permit. In addition, the 2017 LAGWRP tentative permit has kept the RSW-LAGT naming convention.</p> <p>LASAN requests that the naming convention be consistent between DCTWRP and LAGWRP - either retain the naming convention RSW-LATT or change RSW-LAGT in the 2017 LAGWRP tentative permit.</p>		
City of Los Angeles	20	<p>Attachment E, Section II, Table E-1, Page E-6</p> <p><u>Receiving water location RSW630 naming convention and coordinates</u></p> <p>1. The naming convention of RSW630 has changed in this tentative permit.</p> <p>LASAN requests that monitoring location name RSW 630 be revised to RSW 630 (R-7) to be consistent with the naming convention of the other receiving water monitoring location names in this tentative permit.</p> <p>2. LASAN requests to correct coordinates to: Latitude (North) 34.16174, Longitude (West) - 118.46641</p>	<p>The monitoring location description has been revised to include "(previously designated as R-7." Accordingly, the coordinate was also corrected.</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>
City of Los Angeles	21	<p>Attachment E, Section II, Page E-6, Paragraph 2</p> <p><u>Discharge Point name</u></p> <p>The tentative permit states that, "<i>Discharge Serial Numbers 001, 002, 003, 004, 005 and 008 were included in previous Orders, but are not listed here because the NPDES compliance points are EFF-001A and EFF-001B. These other outfall structures discharge after the effluent mingles with other surface waters.</i>"</p>	<p>The receiving water analytical requirements are specified in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8. The flow measurement requirements in Table E-6 are per the flow meters 5A, 5B, 5C and 5D in Attachment B. This clarification was added to VIII.A.2.</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>LASAN still reports 002, 003, and 008 on the Discharge Monitoring Reports for DCTWRP. Since this Order is removing these other Discharge Points from the permit LASAN requests that these points be removed from the DMR reports and the DMR report be updated to just the Discharge Point No. 001A. [Also, see LASAN request in Comment #1]</p>		
City of Los Angeles	22	<p>Attachment E, Section II, Table E-1, Page E-6</p> <p><u>Receiving water location RSW-003D coordinates</u></p> <p>LASAN requests to correct the coordinates to: Latitude (North) 33.81598, Longitude (West) -118.20552</p>	The referenced coordinate was corrected.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	23	<p>Attachment E, Section IV, Page E-8</p> <p><u>Incorrect statement on EFF-001A and 001B</u></p> <p>The following statement at the top of Page E-8 is incorrect.</p> <p>LASAN requests to correct the language to:</p> <p><i>“The sampling location for the effluent discharge to the Los Angeles River is EFF-001A and for bacteria is EFF-001B. for the discharge to the recycled water pipelines.”</i></p>	The mentioned paragraph is a redundant requirement on page E-8, section IV.A.4. The mentioned paragraph is therefore deleted.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	24	<p>Attachment E, Section IV.A, Page E-9</p> <p><u>Correct Footnote 22</u></p> <p>The tentative permit states that, “<i>The Permittee shall extract the maximum daily peak, minimum daily peak, and average daily from the recorded media...</i>”.</p> <p>The requirement of reporting the “Minimum Daily Peak” for Total Residual Chlorine (TRC) should be removed. The TRC normally runs at zero on a continuous basis all day long. If there is a single excursion, there is only</p>	<p>MRP, section I.E., states “The Permittee shall calibrate and perform maintenance procedures on all monitoring instruments to ensure accuracy of measurements, or shall ensure that both equipment activities will be conducted.</p> <p>Since the minimum daily peak requirement was included to verify instrumentation calibration, providing the calibration records is an acceptable substitute. The text of Footnote 8 is revised as follows.</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall extract the maximum daily peak, minimum daily peak, and average daily from the recorded</i></p>	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>a single Maximum Daily Peak and no Minimum Daily Peak. If there are multiple excursions, the Maximum Daily Peak should be reported, but it can be difficult to determine the Minimum Daily Peak. There is no common understanding of what that term means, and the value of the information it provides.</p> <p>LASAN requests that the requirement of reporting Minimum Daily Peak be removed.</p>	<p><i>media and shall be reported on the monthly monitoring reports. <u>In addition, calibration records for the TRC analyzer shall be submitted quarterly</u>.</i></p>	
City of Los Angeles	25	<p>Attachment E, Section IV.A, Page E-10</p> <p><u>Correct Footnote 28</u></p> <p>THM is not in the Basin Plan. Basin Plan only requires inorganic and organic chemicals from the drinking water standards and not disinfection byproduct.</p> <p>LASAN requests to change the footnote 28 to:</p> <p><i>"Total Trihalomethanes is the sum of concentrations of bromodichloromethane, bromoform, chloroform, and dibromochloromethane, and has a Basin Plan limit of 80 ug/L."</i></p>	The language referencing Basin Plan limit was deleted	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	26	<p>Attachment E, Section IV.A, Page E-11</p> <p><u>Formatting issues Footnote 35</u></p> <p>LASAN noticed that the indentations of the footnotes are not consistent throughout the document, including font size.</p> <p>LASAN recommends that the footnotes be formatted consistently.</p>	The footnotes were reformatted accordingly.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	27	<p>Attachment E, Section IV.A, Table E-3, Page E-11</p> <p><u>Change monitoring frequency</u></p>	The Regional Water Board staff agrees that Pentachlorophenol and Benzo(ghi)Perylene have no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the water quality standards. Therefore, it is	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>Pentachlorophenol and Benzo(ghi)Perylene has no reasonable potential.</p> <p>LASAN requests to change the monitoring frequency to Semiannual. In addition, LASAN requests that Benzo(ghi)Perylene be removed from Table E-3.</p>	<p>appropriate to require semiannual monitoring. It is appropriate to not list these two parameters individually in Table E-3 because they are already included in the "Remaining USEPA priority pollutants."</p>	
City of Los Angeles	28	<p>Attachment E, Section IV.A, Table E-3, Page E-12</p> <p><u>Consistency of footnote numbering and description. References 36, 37, 6, 38. Footnotes 36, 37, and 38.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LASAN noticed that the placement and description of footnotes are not consistent throughout the document. Sometimes the footnote description is placed in the same page while other times the description is referred back to the previous pages. LASAN prefers and recommends that the description of the footnotes be placed on the same page and so as not refer back to the previous pages. 2. The reference footnote 6 is not correct. As recommended above, the "Remaining USEPA priority pollutants" should have a new footnote and description placed on the same page. 	<p>The referenced footnotes were formatted for consistency. Footnote 6 was replaced with a new footnote.</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>
City of Los Angeles	29	<p>Attachment E, Section IV.A, Page E-12</p> <p><u>Correct Footnote 37</u></p> <p>Footnote 37 is for PCBs as congeners. For clarity, LASAN requests to change "PCBs means the sum..." to "PCBs <i>as congeners</i> mean the sum..."</p>	<p>The suggested words were inserted in the footnote.</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>
City of Los Angeles	30	<p>Attachment E, Section V.A.7, Paragraph 3, Page E-16</p> <p><u>Ceriodaphnia test</u></p> <p>The number of days to implement the Ceriodaphnia test needs to be 7 as this is how long it takes to prepare the broodboard.</p>	<p>The requested accelerated monitoring schedule was changed from "48 hours" to "seven calendar days."</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>LASAN requests to change 48 hours to seven calendar days.</p> <p>Once the Permittee becomes aware of this result, the Permittee shall implement an accelerated monitoring schedule within seven days for the Ceriodaphnia dubia test, and within 5 calendar days for both the Pimephales promelas and Selenastrum capricornutum tests.</p>		
City of Los Angeles	31	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1, Table E-5, Page E19</p> <p><u>Flow units consistency</u></p> <p>LASAN requests that the receiving water flow unit be consistent in the document. LASAN prefers cfs.</p>	MGD was replaced with "cfs."	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	32	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1, Table E-5, Page E19</p> <p><u>THM monitoring frequency</u></p> <p>THM effluent monitoring frequency is semiannually.</p> <p>LASAN requests that THM receiving water monitoring frequency also be semi-annually.</p>	THM monitoring frequency was changed to semiannually.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	33	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1, Table E-5, Page E19</p> <p><u>Monitoring frequency of Total kjeldahl nitrogen and Total nitrogen</u></p> <p>The monitoring frequencies of Total kjeldahl nitrogen, Organic nitrogen, and Total nitrogen frequency be the same. Organic nitrogen is part of Total kjeldahl nitrogen and Total nitrogen</p> <p>LASAN request to change the monitoring frequencies of Total Kjeldahl nitrogen and Total nitrogen to monthly since Organic nitrogen's frequency is monthly.</p>	Total kjeldahl nitrogen and Total nitrogen monitoring frequency is reduced to "monthly."	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
City of Los Angeles	34	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1, Table E-5, Page E-20</p> <p><u>Mercury monitoring frequency</u></p> <p>Mercury has no reasonable potential. LASAN requests to change monitoring frequency from monthly to quarterly.</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board staff agrees that mercury has no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the water quality standard. Therefore, mercury monitoring frequency is reduced to “quarterly.”</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>
City of Los Angeles	35	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1, Page E-20</p> <p><u>Correct footnote 43, mercury testing</u></p> <p>Table E-5 is for monitoring frequency for receiving water samples and not effluent. LASAN requests to correct the footnote 43 to: <i>“The mercury effluent samples shall be analyzed...”</i></p>	<p>The word “effluent” was removed from the footnote.</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>
City of Los Angeles	36	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1, Table E-5, Page E-21</p> <p><u>Consistency of footnotes and description.</u> <u>Footnotes 22, 23, 24.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LASAN noticed that the placement and description of footnotes are not consistent throughout the document. Sometimes the footnote description is placed in the same page while other times the description is referred back to the previous pages. LASAN prefers and recommends that the description of the footnotes be placed on the same page and so as not refer back to the previous pages. 2. LASAN requests to correct the footnotes for pesticides, PCB, and “Remaining USEPA priority pollutants”. 3. If both PCBs as Arochlors and PCBs as Congeners are required to be monitored, LASAN requests to separate the row for each, along with separate footnotes and PCBs as Arochlors be reported in 	<p>The footnotes were formatted for consistency. The PCBs were split to “as arochlors” and “as congeners” with the associated footnote. A footnote was placed on the “Remaining USEPA priority pollutants.”</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		units of ug/L, while PCBs as Congeners by EPA 1668C be reported in units of pg/L.		
City of Los Angeles	37	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.2, Table E-6, Page E-22.</p> <p><u>Missing footnotes on Mercury, Pesticide, PCBs and “Remaining USEPA priority pollutants”.</u></p> <p>1. There are no footnotes for Mercury, Pesticide, PCBs and “Remaining USEPA priority pollutants”.</p> <p>LASAN requests to add footnotes for Mercury, Pesticide, PCBs and “Remaining USEPA priority pollutants”.</p> <p>2. If both PCBs as Arochlors and PCBs as Congeners are required to be monitored, LASAN requests to separate the row for each, along with separate footnotes and PCBs as Arochlors be reported in units of ug/L, while PCBs as Congeners by EPA 1668C be reported in units of pg/L.</p>	<p>Corresponding footnotes were created for Mercury, pesticide, PCBs and “Remaining USEPA priority pollutants.”</p> <p>The PCBs were split to “as arochlors” and “as congeners” with the associated footnote.</p>	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	38	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.A.3, Table E-7, Page E-23.</p> <p><u>Remove Chloride and TDS</u></p> <p>LASAN requests that TDS and Chloride be removed. The monitoring requirements for the lakes are based on the Department Recreation and Parks’ management plans, which were developed in 1991. The requirements were developed for the purpose of protecting aquatic wildlife, human health (i.e., water contact), and providing information for lake management. It was decided by the team that developed the management plan that TDS and chloride did not need to be monitored since they provided no information that would help in lake management or in assessing protection of wildlife and human health. In addition, conductivity, which is directly related to TDS, is already tested monthly at</p>	The chloride and total dissolved solids were removed from Table E-23.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>Lake Balboa. TDS and chloride are also already tested for in the effluent and at 6 stations in the LA River and its tributaries. TDS and chloride should be removed from the lakes monitoring requirements since they are redundant and provide no useful information for wildlife and health protection or lake management issues.</p>		
City of Los Angeles	39	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.C.1, Table E-9, Page E-25.</p> <p><u>Sediment monitoring location</u></p> <p>In this tentative permit, the sediment monitoring locations are RSW-4 and RSW-W2, but RSW622 is missing. According to an administrative letter dated February 13, 2012, the Regional Water Board approved LASAN's request to include RSW 622.</p> <p>LASAN would like confirmation if RSW 622 was intentionally removed.</p>	RSW-LATT622 will be included in the sediment monitoring location.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	40	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.C.1, Table E-9, Page E-25</p> <p><u>Missing footnotes for Pesticide, PCBs and "Remaining USEPA priority pollutants".</u></p> <p>1. There are no footnotes for Pesticide, PCBs and "Remaining USEPA priority pollutants".</p> <p>LASAN requests to define and add footnotes for Pesticide, PCBs and "Remaining USEPA priority pollutants".</p> <p>2.If PCBs means PCBs as Arochlors, please specify. If both PCBs as Arochlors and PCBs as Congeners are required to be monitored, LASAN requests to separate the row for each, along with separate footnotes.</p>	Regional Water Board staff discussed the revision with the City of Los Angeles staff. Regional Water Board staff's intent in this tentative permit is to keep the same requirement as in the current Order. There is no additional sediment monitoring requirements for this section. Therefore, to avoid confusion, Table 8 from the current Order R4-2011-0196 will be retained.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
City of Los Angeles	41	<p>Attachment E, Section VIII.E, Page E-26.</p> <p><u>Specify monitoring Location Name</u></p> <p>LASAN recommends specifying the Monitoring Location Name RSW-003D as defined on Page E-6.</p> <p>LASAN requests to correct the coordinates for the LA River Wardlow Station Stream flow gage to Latitude (North) 33.81598, Longitude (West) -118.20552.</p>	RSW-003D was specified in the stream flow monitoring location. The coordinate for latitude was also corrected.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	42	<p>Attachment E, Section IX.A, Page E-27</p> <p><u>Typo error</u></p> <p>LASAN requests to correct the paragraph heading to: “Los Angeles River <i>Watershed Monitoring</i> Program (LARWMP)”</p>	The paragraph heading was corrected.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	43	<p>Attachment F, Section II.A.1, Paragraph 1, Page F-4</p> <p><u>Correct flow language</u></p> <p>The tentative permit states that, “<i>In 2015, the average treated tertiary-treated municipal wastewater was approximately 46.1 MGD</i>”. The 2015 DCTWRP effluent discharge (tertiary-treated wastewater) averaged 35 MGD while the average influent flow to DCTWRP in 2015 averaged 46.1 MGD.</p> <p>LASAN requests the following corrections: “<i>In 2015, the average <u>daily influent flow</u> treated tertiary-treated municipal wastewater was approximately 46.1 MGD</i>”.</p>	The sentence was edited to reflect the suggested changes.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	44	<p>Attachment F, Section II.B.1.a, Page F-6</p> <p><u>Incorrect language</u></p>	The sentence was edited to reflect the suggested changes.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>LASAN requests to change: “Discharge to Los Angeles River via Wildlife Lake, Lake Balboa...” to:</p> <p>“Discharge to Los Angeles River, <u>directly and</u> via Wildlife Lake, Lake Balboa...”</p>		
City of Los Angeles	45	<p>Attachment F, Section II.C.1, Table F-2, Page F-9</p> <p><u>Mercury daily limit</u></p> <p>In Table F-2, the mercury daily maximum limit in the 2011 permit is wrong. LASAN requests to change to 0.15 ug/l from 0.051 ug/l.</p>	The typo was corrected.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	46	<p>Attachment F, Section IV.C.4.b.i, Page F-9, Paragraph 1</p> <p><u>WLA for copper</u></p> <p>LASAN requests to correct WLA for copper to 26 ug/l from 103 ug/l.</p>	The typo was corrected.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	47	<p>Attachment F, Section IV.D.1.b, Page F-64</p> <p><u>Reopener clause</u></p> <p>The permit characterizes the ammonia and copper limits as water quality based effluent limits (WQBELs) even though these limits are not based on water quality objectives and are solely based on performance. Thus, these are more appropriately characterized as performance based effluent limits (PBELs).</p> <p>Although the City may be able to meet the proposed PBELs currently, the concern is that this will not be true in the future. While the City appreciates the addition of a reopener, this reopener will not protect the City from MMPs should a PBEL be exceeded for reasons beyond its control. Further, the City wants to</p>	<p>When drafting a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, a permit writer must consider the impact of the proposed discharge on the quality of the receiving water. Water quality goals for a waterbody are defined by state water quality standards. By analyzing the effect of a discharge on the receiving water, a permit writer could find that technology-based effluent limitations (TBELs) alone will not achieve the applicable water quality standards. In such cases, the Clean Water Act (CWA) and its implementing regulations require development of water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs). WQBELs help meet the CWA objective of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters and the goal of water quality that provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water (fishable/swimmable). WQBELs are designed to protect water quality by ensuring that water quality standards are</p>	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>make sure that there are no future backsliding issues related to these performance-based limits should performance differ in the future.</p> <p>To address these concerns, the City requests the following minor changes be made to the reopener provisions of the permit and fact sheet.</p> <p><i>“In addition, this Order includes a reopener that allows for modification of the NPDES Order to recalculate the WQBEL limits for ammonia as nitrogen and/or copper, to incorporate a revised margin of safety factor reflective of plant performance consistent with <u>and up to the maximum limits allowed by</u> the applicable TMDLs, if <u>the discharger provides new information to the Regional Board that shows</u> flow conditions or other extenuating circumstances cause a significant change in the water reclamation plant’s treatment performance.”</i></p>	<p>met in the receiving water.</p> <p>The proposed effluent limitations for copper and ammonia are not TBELs. In that regard, the calculated effluent limitations for copper and ammonia are considered WQBELs because they are intended and designed to protect water quality by ensuring that water quality standards are met in the receiving water. Therefore, the “water quality based” cannot be removed in that sentence.</p> <p>However, the proposed, modified, additional language in the paragraph will be inserted as stated in your comment.</p>	
City of Los Angeles	48	<p>Attachment F, Section VII.B, Table F-13, Page F-73, F-74</p> <p><u>Column header, Acute toxicity</u></p> <p>LASAN requests to change header name in column 3 from 2016 to 2017.</p> <p>Acute toxicity monitoring is no longer required. LASAN requests to change monitoring frequency to “not required”.</p>	The typo was corrected.	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	49	<p>Attachment F, Section VII.B, Table F-13, Page F-73</p> <p><u>Frequency does not match that listed in Effluent Monitoring Table E-3</u></p> <p>Sulfate, Nitrate-N, Nitrite-N, Organic-N, and Total Nitrogen are listed as changing from monthly to quarterly. However, in the Effluent Monitoring Table in</p>	The frequency of the mentioned parameters in Table F-13 were revised to match Table E-3 of the MRP.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>Attachment E, Table E-3, pages E-9 and E-10, the frequencies of these compounds are listed as monthly.</p> <p>LASAN requests that Table F-13 be corrected to match Table E-3.</p>		
City of Los Angeles	50	<p>Attachment F, Section VII.B, Table F-13, Page F-73</p> <p><u>Fecal Coliform and E. Coli</u></p> <p>In Table F-13, fecal coliform is listed as “daily” under the 2011 Permit column and no “change” under the 2017 Permit column for the monitoring frequency. Fecal coliform has been removed from the tentative permit.</p> <p>E Coli is listed as “weekly” under the 2011 Permit column and “no change” under the 2017 Permit column for the monitoring frequency. E Coli is now required to be tested daily from the tentative permit.</p> <p>LASAN requests that monitoring frequency for fecal coliforms be changed to “not required” and E coli to “daily” under the “2017 Permit” column in Table F-13.</p>	In Table F-13, fecal coliform monitoring frequency is revised to “not required” and E.coli to “daily.”	Revisions were made to the permit.
City of Los Angeles	51	<p>Attachment H, Section B.1, Page H-3</p> <p><u>Local Limit evaluation report</u></p> <p>The City’s Hyperion Treatment System (HTS) is a joint outfall system consisting of the wastewater collection system and four treatment plants (HTP, DCTWRP, LAGWRP, and BWRP). Because of the interconnection of the treatment plants, LASAN conducts the local limit evaluation on the entire Hyperion Service Area. This tentative permit requires LASAN to provide written technical evaluation of the need to revise local limits within 180 days of the issuance of DCTWRP NPDES permit.</p> <p>LASAN requests that the submission of local limit</p>	Comment accepted.	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>evaluation report be synchronized among the DCTWRP, LAGWRP, and HTP. As result, LASAN requests the following change:</p> <p><i>"In accordance with 40 CFR § 122.44(j) (2) (ii), the POTW shall provide a written technical evaluation of the need to revise local limits under 40 CFR § 403.5(c) (1) within 180 days of issuance or reissuance of the Tillman Water Quality Control <u>Hyperion Treatment Plant (TILLMAN WRP)</u> NPDES permit.</i></p> <p>The above language is the same as written in the 2017 LAGWRP Tentative Permit.</p>		
Comments received from Heal the Bay on February 6, 2017				
Heal the Bay	1	<p>In order to help all three WRPs' recycling efforts in a similar way to what was done in the Monitoring and Reporting Program in the latest permit for Hyperion Treatment Plant (effective April 1, 2017; Sec. X.C.4), we request that the Tentative WDRs include a requirement for all three WRPs to submit a "recycled water progress report" along with each NPDES Annual Summary Report to the Regional Board. As the Regional Board mentions in its response to Hyperion Treatment Plant's comments (response to Los Angeles Waterkeeper's first comment, p. 57 of "Response to Comments," January 20, 2017), it will serve the purpose to "encourage water recycling and to communicate progress on the Permittee's recycling program."</p>	<p>To encourage water recycling and to communicate progress on the Permittee's recycling program, a requirement to submit a recycled water progress report with each NPDES Annual Report was added to section X.D.2 of the MRP of the Tentative Order</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>
Heal the Bay	2	<p>Considering reporting, within Hyperion's recent WDR permit that becomes effective on April 1, 2017, the plant's supervisors were asked to report to Heal the Bay (in addition to local public and environmental health officers) if and when any unauthorized discharge of sewage occurs in an amount greater than 1000 gallons (Section VI.C.6.c.i. of all three permits).</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board staff agree that LASAN should be transparent and direct with reporting sewage spills. Section VI.C.6.a.ii. of the Tentative Order was modified to include Heal the Bay in the list of notifications after a sewage spill.</p>	<p>Revisions were made to the permit.</p>

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		We request that a similar requirement be included in the Tentative WDRs so that Heal the Bay can continue to be an effective partner in public notification about these issues.		
Comments received from Los Angeles Water Keeper on February 6, 2017				
LA Waterkeeper	1	The three POTWs function, along with the Hyperion POTW operated by the City of Los Angeles, as part of an “integrated network” (Burbank Tentative, page 76 of 148) in which solids from the POTWs in the Los Angeles river watershed are transported to Hyperion for further treatment. All three POTWs are located in the watershed of the Los Angeles River, and discharge to the river or its tributaries. The cumulative impact of the three POTWs on the river is huge—the discharge provides the vast majority of the dry season flows in the river. The treated discharge supports a number of beneficial uses, including habitat for four rare and threatened aquatic species, and an increasingly important recreational resource for Angelinos and visitors, including a growing interest in kayaking. ¹ Some level of base flow is necessary to maintaining these uses of the river, although the native aquatic species are adapted to seasonal periods of extremely low flow.	The Regional Water Board staff agree that the discharge from the three POTWs provide the vast majority of the dry season flows in the river.	None necessary.
LA Waterkeeper	2	The City of Los Angeles analyzed the relationship between base flows and beneficial uses in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for its Tillman Groundwater Replenishment project, and determined that a 27 MGD base flow in the river could support the beneficial uses. The City therefore committed to maintaining a 27 million gallon per day base flow in the Los Angeles River and several nearby ponds as a	In 2016, the DCTWRP discharged approximately 26.6 mgd to the Los Angeles River. The facility also reused approximately 6% of the total quantity produced. In an effort to maximize the reuse of recycled water, it is expected that the amount of recycled water reused would also increase, thereby reducing the amount of discharge to the Los Angeles River. Given that the influent flow to the facility has not changed due to water conservation, and the amount of	None necessary.

¹ Water Quality Control Plan, Los Angeles Region, Basin plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (4), Table 2-1 Beneficial Uses of Inland Surface Waters, 2-12 (adopted June 13, 1994, as amended).

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		mitigation commitment, but the Tentative WDR for Tillman does not make mention of this commitment to base flows, nor include the commitment as a condition of the WDR.	<p>recycled water is increasing, the amount of wastewater discharge to the Los Angeles River would gradually decrease and therefore would not be able to maintain the 27 mgd base flow.</p> <p>Before the City may reduce the amount of discharge to the Los Angeles River, the City must comply with California Water Code section 1211 and receive authorization from the State Water Resources Control Board.</p> <p>Also, please see response to comment #5 below.</p>	
LA Waterkeeper	3	The WDR for Los Angeles-Glendale includes an express finding that the region has a need for recycled water, especially during droughts. (Glendale Tentative, page 76 of 150.) Yet all of the WDRs defer analysis of this important issue, including conditions that the plant operators investigate the feasibility of recycling treated wastewater. If found feasible, POTW operators would be required to initiate or update the process provided for in Section 1211 of the Water Code for additional analysis and application for water rights from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These analyses would be submitted when the permits are next up for renewal. ² (Glendale Tentative, page 91 of 150; Burbank Tentative, page 89 of 148; Tillman Tentative, page 96 of 163.) Waiting at least five years, and potentially longer, is unacceptable given the need for recycled water and the potential wastefulness of a lengthy delay.	<p>The City has been using recycled wastewater per approved uses under California Code of Regulations Title 22. Its current uses include landscape irrigation, industrial uses including cooling tower makeup, fire protection, channel flushing, foam control, and dust control. The City has delivered recycled water for irrigation and other uses to the Woodley Golf Course, Japanese Garden, Balboa Recreation Lake, and Wildlife Lake.</p> <p>The City has a number of recycling projects being considered for implementation and includes the Regional Water Board staff in their stakeholder meetings. The timing for recycling projects will not be determined by the renewal of this Order.</p>	None necessary.
LA Waterkeeper	4	The tentative WDRs all mention the Water Code exemption from Chapter 3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). (See Water Code	The Regional Water Board does not agree that further analysis under CEQA is required for the adoption of this NPDES permit. This issue has been litigated and courts	None necessary.

² The Section 1211 analysis is outside the scope of the Section 13889 partial CEQA exemption and thus subject to full CEQA review, as recognized by the Regional Board itself. (See http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/applications/wastewaterchange/) Since the Section 1211 process is also outside the scope of the Water Boards' certified regulatory agency status, the documents resulting from the Section 1211 process would take the form of an EIR or Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>Section 13889 and Glendale Tentative page 86 of 150; Burbank Tentative page 84 of 148; and Tillman Tentative page 92 of 163.) Despite the facial limitation of the exemption to Chapter 3, the Tentative WDRs are all treat CEQA as wholly inapplicable. No analysis or findings are included for those parts of CEQA that apply to the project. Of particular importance is Section 21002 of the Public Resources Code, located in Chapter 1 of CEQA, which bans agencies from approving projects when feasible alternatives exist with fewer environmental impacts. Approval of the Tentative WDRs would be premature unless analysis is undertaken to allow the Regional Board to make such a finding—especially since the WDRs do not include analysis of what base flow is necessary to support beneficial uses of the river, or what potential exists for increasing recycled water. Such an analysis would necessarily include cumulative impacts of the entire “integrated system” (including Hyperion) and balancing of impacts and benefits envisioned by Section 1211 of the Water Code.</p>	<p>have concluded that the Regional Water Board is not required to prepare environmental documents or engage in any other form of environmental review under CEQA. See e.g., County of Los Angeles v. California State Water Resources Control Board, 143 Cal.App.4th 985, 1003-1007. In addition, the State Water Board has issued CEQA regulations that state: “Neither the state board nor the regional boards shall be required to comply with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code prior to the adoption of any waste discharge requirement, except requirements for new sources as defined in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.” Further: “Environmental documents are not required for adoption of waste discharge requirements under Chapter 5.5, Division 7 of the Water Code, except requirements for new sources as defined in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This exemption is in accordance with Water Code Section 13389 which does not apply to the policy provisions of Chapter 1 of CEQA.” See California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3733.</p> <p>In addition, the commenter refers to Water Code section 1211 to support its comment that CEQA applies to adoption of the NPDES permit. Section 1211 requires the owner of a wastewater treatment plant to obtain approval from the State Water Resources Control Board prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater. The Regional Water Board does not have jurisdiction over such “change petitions.”</p>	
LA Waterkeeper	5	<p>Further, the tentative WDRs do not make findings or include analysis of Article X, Section 2 of the California Constitution, which prohibits waste and unreasonable use of water. Instead, as described above, the WDRs put off any Waste and Unreasonable Use analysis for at least five years. The discharge of millions of gallons of treated wastewater, beyond that essential for maintaining beneficial uses, particularly when the point of discharge is located over a groundwater aquifer, is</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board agrees that the California Constitution sections cited set forth the intent that the State prevent the waste and unreasonable use of water and that the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) has broad authority to control and condition water use. The Regional Water Board also agrees that increasing the use of recycled water is important. The State and Regional Water Boards share independent yet overlapping duties in the regulation of recycled water. The Regional</p>	None necessary.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>unreasonable and a waste of that water. Permitting that continued waste via the WDRs is contrary to law. Further, compliance with the mandate of the California Constitution and the Water Code in evaluating the reasonableness of the discharges permitted under the WDRs would provide the balanced, region-wide and integrated review of water supply, wastewater discharges, and recycling that is particularly appropriate here. LAW recently commented on the issue of waste and unreasonable use at length when the Hyperion WDR was up for renewal, and is attaching those comments as a possible guide to what type of analysis would be appropriate for the POTWs in the Los Angeles River watershed. (Obviously, some important differences exist between direct ocean discharge of treated wastewater and discharge to a river system supporting beneficial uses.) LAW is also working with the City of Los Angeles to address its concerns specific to Hyperion.</p>	<p>Water Board is authorized to issue NPDES permits and waste discharge requirements and prescribe water reclamation requirements for individual water recycling projects and to issue master water recycling permits. See, e.g., California Water Code §§ 13263, 13377, 13523, and 13523.1. The State Water Board is directly responsible for carrying out the constitutional and statutory mandates to prevent the unreasonable use and waste of all water in California, and for administering public trust resources on behalf of the people of the State. See, e.g., California Water Code §§ 275, 1831– 1836.</p> <p>The commenter asserts that issuing the NPDES permit without a waste and unreasonable use analysis is contrary to law. The Regional Water Board disagrees. As further discussed below, the State Water Board has authority to enforce the laws to prevent waste and unreasonable use of water. The Regional Water Board has no mandatory legal duty or obligation to make waste and unreasonable use findings as a condition of issuing NPDES permits.</p> <p>The California Constitution and California Water Code enunciate the State’s core water policy that water users may not unreasonably use or waste water. (See, e.g., Cal. Const., art. X, § 2; Wat. Code, § 100.) The Legislature through Water Code section 275 authorized the State Water Board to take actions to enforce those core principles. Water Code section 275 provides, in full:</p> <p>“The department [of water resources] and the board [State Water Board] shall take all appropriate proceedings or actions before executive, legislative, or judicial agencies to prevent waste, unreasonable use, unreasonable method of use, or unreasonable method of diversion of water in this state.”</p> <p>The State Water Board may take, and has taken, “appropriate actions,” including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiating enforcement action against water right 	

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>holders who the State Board has determined are unreasonably using water. (Imperial Irrigation District v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 186 Cal.App.3d 1160.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopting regulations to prohibit categories of unreasonable uses of water. (Light v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 1463, 1482-1483.) • Denying applications to divert surface waters. (Central Delta Water Agency v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 245.) <p>In addition, Water Code section 275 does not create a mandatory duty of a regional board to prevent the waste or unreasonable use of water.</p> <p>In 2009, the State Water Board adopted Resolution 2009-0011, Adoption of a Policy for Water Quality Control for Recycled Water (Recycled Water Policy) (Revised January 22, 2013, effective April 25, 2013.) (Recycled Water Policy or Policy). The Recycled Water Policy sets forth the duties with respect to recycled water of the State Water Board, the Regional Water Boards, the California Department of Public Health (now, the Division of Drinking Water (DDW) within the State Water Board for those duties related to drinking water), the California Department of Water Resources, and the California Public Utilities Commission. As summarized in the Policy, the State Water Board's duties for recycled water projects include general oversight, review of regional water board permitting practices, and leading efforts to meet the recycled water use goals set forth in the Policy. The Regional Water Boards' duties for recycled water include protection of surface and groundwater resources and the issuance of permits that implement DDW recommendations, and the Recycled Water Policy, and other Basin Plan requirements. The Policy also directs the Regional Water Boards to use their authority to encourage the use of recycled water.</p>	

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>The Recycled Water Policy also declares that pursuant to Water Code section 13550 et seq., “it is a waste and unreasonable use of water for water agencies not to use recycled water when recycled water of adequate quality is available and is not being put to beneficial use, subject to the established conditions established in section 13550 et seq.” Further, the Policy states that the State Water Board shall exercise its authority pursuant to Water Code section 275 to the fullest extent policy to enforce the use of recycled water. Section 13550 authorizes the State Water Board to determine whether the use of potable water for nonpotable use is a waste and unreasonable use based on specific criteria.</p> <p>The proposed Order is consistent with the applicable law and the Recycled Water Policy. The proposed Order addresses the proper treatment of wastewater and it is consistent with the Recycled Water Policy because it sets forth requirements, including effluent limitations and prohibitions to protect surface and groundwater resources, and encourages the use of recycled water that in turn results in a reduction in wasted water. While the Regional Water Board may encourage recycling, it may not order the discharger to recycle a certain quantity of water in an NPDES permit. The Order encourages recycling by including a requirement that the permittee conduct a feasibility study concerning recycling and make a report to the Regional Water Board.</p>	
LA Waterkeeper	6	The discussion of public participation is quite confusing, repeatedly referring to future events in the past tense. (See, for example, Glendale Tentative page 143 of 150.) It is also unclear whether the Regional Board will consider the record to be “open” on March 2, should members of the public have additional concerns and wish to raise such issues at the hearing.	<p>The tentative draft section section IX, Public Participation indicates that;</p> <p><i>Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Regional Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.</i></p> <p>The tentative language is in the past tense because once the permit is adopted, it will be accurate.</p>	None necessary.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>The public notice for this matter stated that written comments or testimony would be accepted until 5:00 pm on February 6, 2017. The Regional Water Board will not accept additional written comments or evidence as set forth in California Code of Regulations title 23, section 648.4. Interested persons may make oral comments at the hearing, subject to time limits imposed by the Board Chair, but additional written comments will generally not be accepted.</p>	
		<p>LAW thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the important Tentative WDRs. The permit decisions made now will have important ramifications for the Los Angeles River and for realizing the potential of the Central Groundwater Basin to provide water for the region.</p>	<p>Thank you for commenting on this tentative NPDES permit.</p>	
<p>Comments received from Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works (SCAP) on February 6, 2017</p>				
<p>SCAP</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><u>Oppose Chronic Toxicity Limitations</u></p> <p>SCAP opposes the adoption of any permit that contains chronic toxicity requirements which they believe are unlawful and violate federal and state law. The WRP permits proposed for adoption on March 2nd continue to contain effluent limitations, monitoring requirements, and compliance determinations for chronic toxicity that violate both federal regulatory requirements and binding State Water Board precedent applicable to the Regional Board.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles WRP has final effluent limitations for chronic toxicity because it has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to chronic toxicity in the receiving waters. Section II.D. of the Fact Sheet explains that the facility has exceeded the 1 TUc trigger contained in Order 2011. Thus, the permit implements 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(v).</p> <p>Section 4 of the SIP contains toxicity control provisions, including the following on page 30:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A chronic toxicity effluent limitation is required in permits for all discharges that will cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to chronic toxicity in receiving waters.”</p> <p>The chronic toxicity limitations are not unlawful and are authorized by the SIP and NPDES regulations.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
SCAP	2	<p data-bbox="457 228 898 256"><u>Concern about recycled water appeal</u></p> <p data-bbox="457 289 1108 467">SCAP considers the use of the TST null hypothesis as unlawful because the recycled water produced by the WRP is presumed toxic, and must be disproved. They are concerned that this presumption may make recycled water reuse less attractive in a time when water reuse is vital.</p>	<p data-bbox="1108 228 1829 500">The demand for recycled water is high, especially during the drought and as a result of water conservation efforts. There is less recycled water available for distribution in some watersheds. For example, in the San Gabriel River watershed, one producer of recycled water has rejected a groundwater recharge project because it does not have extra water for additional projects. This increase in demand has occurred subsequent to the Regional Water Board's use of TST in permits.</p>	None necessary
SCAP	3	<p data-bbox="457 534 961 561"><u>PMSD and Concentration response curves</u></p> <p data-bbox="457 594 1108 773">SCAP considers use of the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) statistical procedure as unapproved and unlawful, because it only compares 100% recycled water to a control, without the use and analysis of a multi-concentration response curves and the Percent Minimum Significant Difference (PMSD).</p>	<p data-bbox="1108 534 1829 743">This MRP does require that chronic toxicity sampling for the Facility be conducted according to the Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms (USEPA 2002, EPA-821-R-02-013), which is the appropriate test method referenced in 40 CFR Part 136 for compliance purposes with the chronic toxicity final effluent limitation.</p> <p data-bbox="1108 776 1829 1117">The State permitting authority, here, the Regional Water Board, has the discretion to select the statistical approach for analyzing whole effluent toxicity (WET) test data that is most appropriate for use in a particular permit to protect the Basin Plan Water Quality Objective for toxicity. (See Section 9.4.1.2 of Short-term Methods, October 2002, EPA-821-R-02-013 (“[T]he statistical methods recommended in the manual are not the only possible methods of statistical analysis.”)) The Regional Water Board has selected the TST statistical approach for use in this Order.</p> <p data-bbox="1108 1149 1829 1445">The 2017 Order contains quality assurance measures using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) for conducting statistical analysis of the toxicity results. The TST statistical t-test approach is described in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1, Table A-1 and Appendix B, Table B-1. Also, see National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Technical Document ((EPA 833-R-10-004, 2010).</p>	None necessary.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>The Fact Sheet explains why appropriate interpretation of the measurement result from the TST statistical approach is independent from the concentration-response patterns of the toxicity tests for those samples.</p> <p>Regarding the use of variability criteria (USEPA 2000) recommended PMSD criteria are not implemented as a component of the statistical endpoint calculation for a toxicity test. Rather, the PMSD criteria are implemented as a chronic toxicity test review step for only some of USEPA's 2002 WET methods. The upper PMSD criterion is used to invalidate highly variable/insensitive tests to control within test variability as an incentive for laboratories to implement within test precision. The lower PMSD concentration is used to avoid penalizing laboratories that achieve very high within-test precision. These PMSD criteria are intended specifically for multi-concentration toxicity tests in which the NOEC-LOEC are determined by hypothesis testing. This is because a multi-concentration toxicity test's PMSD includes exactly that variability affecting determination of the NOEC and LOEC, providing control over the total within test variability.</p> <p>It is reasonable and appropriate for the Regional Water Board to conclude that the PMSD tool for evaluating test variability is not applicable to this permit because it does not include chronic toxicity limits expressed as TUc or NOEC. While section 10.2.8.2 of the WET Test Method specifies that "When NPDES permits require sublethal hypothesis testing endpoints from Methods 1000.0, 1002.0, or 1003.0 (e.g., growth or reproduction NOECs and LOECs), within-test variability must be reviewed and variability criteria must be applied as described in this section (10.2.8.2)" (emphasis added), the WET Test Method section does not always require the use of the PMSD.</p> <p>Subsection 10.2.8.2.1 describes how to calculate the PMSD and subsequent subsections describe how to compare the PMSD to see if the PMSD falls within an</p>	

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>acceptable range; i.e. if the test's PMSD is within the upper and lower bounds.</p> <p>Subsection 10.2.8.3 states: "To assist in reviewing within-test variability, EPA recommends maintaining control charts of PMSDs calculated for successive effluent tests (USEPA, 2000b). A control chart of PMSD values characterizes the range of variability observed within a given laboratory, and allows comparison of individual test PMSDs with the laboratory's typical range of variability. Control charts of other variability and test performance measures, such as the MSD, standard deviation or CV of control responses, or average control response, also may be useful for reviewing tests and minimizing variability. The log of PMSD will provide an approximately normal variate useful for control charting." (emphasis added)</p> <p>As described above, USEPA sometimes requires use of PMSD criteria when the hypothesis test has endpoints expressed in terms of growth or reproduction NOECs and LOECs. However, the Burbank WRP permit does not have endpoints expressed as NOEC/LOEC, but not in terms of Pass or Fail and Percent Effect. In addition, under this permit, within-test variability of the WET test data utilized for the TST statistics will be reviewed and variability criteria will be applied by using control charts and coefficient of variation, as allowed by Subsection 10.2.8.3 of the WET Test Method. Therefore, the permit disallows the PMSD approach to evaluate variability of the WET test data because that approach is applicable to the NOEC/LOEC statistical analysis and not the TST statistics required by the permit.</p> <p>USEPA's Method Guidance addressing concentration-response evaluations, states that an "evaluation of the concentration-response relationship generated for each sample is an important part of the data review process that should not be overlooked." This guidance was developed in 2002, well before development of the TST statistical</p>	

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>approach. The guidance assumes that either NOEC-LOEC hypothesis testing or a point estimation analysis will be used to evaluate multi-concentration WET test data. In that circumstance, evaluation of the concentration-response relationship is important to determine whether the assumptions underlying these statistical approaches are reflected in the data. As previously discussed, these same assumptions are not relied upon by the TST statistical approach. A WET test is validated by reviewing the test acceptability criteria and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) measures, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performing and evaluating reference toxicant tests. • Evaluating various test condition components, such as water quality measurements (temperature, pH, DO, light intensity, etc.) to ensure that they are within the typically accepted range. • Examining effluent sampling and handling. • Plotting control charts to track the lab's control performance and reference toxicant performance over time. 	
SCAP	4	<p><u>Chronic toxicity Limitations</u></p> <p>Use of Pass/Fail effluent limits also not prescribed by the promulgated methods, and directly contrary to precedential State Water Board orders directed at this Regional Board to not use numeric effluent limits, and to instead use triggers for additional monitoring to confirm the existence of toxicity, and to address the underlying cause of toxicity. See SWRCB Order Nos. 2003-0012 and 2003-0013. This mandate remains in place until the State Board adopts a new policy on how to craft permit requirements for chronic toxicity.</p>	<p>The numeric effluent limitation for chronic toxicity in this Order employs in part the TST. The TST is recommended by the most recent USEPA guidance as an appropriate test for chronic toxicity. This Regional Water Board and other regional boards are choosing to use the TST to determine compliance with numeric effluent limitations for toxicity. Additional information about and the basis for utilizing a TST-based limit is included in the fact sheet on pages F-59 through F-62.</p> <p>The commenter raises two issues regarding the effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. First, whether the limit should serve as a numeric effluent limitation or, rather, as a trigger for additional evaluation of toxic constituents in the effluent. Second, whether the TST is the appropriate test to determine compliance with the numeric limit, whether that limit be a numeric effluent limitation or a trigger for further analysis.</p>	None necessary.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>This Order must include effluent limitations that will achieve and maintain compliance with water quality standards in the Basin Plan for the Los Angeles Region, which includes a narrative water quality standard for toxicity that requires all surface waters to “be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic.” Effluent limitations in this Order must assure that the discharge will not cause or contribute to a violation of this standard.</p> <p>Federal regulations establish an explicit presumption that a numeric effluent limit – rather than a non-numeric limit – is required by the Clean Water Act to make reasonable further progress toward the goal of eliminating pollutants into the nation’s waters. Non-numeric effluent limits may only replace numeric effluent limits in an NPDES permit if a numeric limit is “infeasible.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.44). This presumption of a numeric limitation applies to effluent limitations for toxicity: “A limit on whole effluent toxicity refers to a numeric effluent limitation” 54 Fed. Reg. 23868, 23871. Because a numeric limit for chronic toxicity is feasible, a numeric limit must be included in this Order.</p> <p>The State Water Board has declined to make a determination regarding the propriety (and feasibility) of numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. (See WQ Orders 2003-0012 and 2003-0013). The State Water Board declared in the 2003 Orders that the issue would be better addressed through a modification to the SIP. The State Water Board replaced the numeric effluent limits for toxicity in the permits at issue with narrative effluent limits (i.e., a series of actions performed by the permittee intended to address effluent toxicity), with the expectation that the SIP would soon be modified. Nearly 15 years and two NPDES permit cycles have since passed, and no such modification has been made. (See draft Policy for Toxicity Assessment and Control, SWRCB, October 2012). Concerns about the application of mandatory minimum penalties for violations of a numeric toxicity effluent</p>	

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>limitation have also been statutorily corrected. (See Water Code § 13385(h)(2)(i)(1)(D)). This Regional Water Board must therefore exercise its own discretion to determine whether numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity are feasible and appropriate at this time.</p> <p>This approach was consistent with the State Board's then-recent determination that a definite instruction regarding effluent limitations for chronic toxicity would soon be provided by the SIP. Today, two permit cycles later, numeric testing methods for chronic toxicity are endorsed by USEPA. The TST simplifies interpretation of toxicity test results and increases confidence in the results compared to other statistical approaches.</p> <p>The "trigger" approach has been criticized by USEPA in public comments (2008 and 2014 letters regarding) and during quality reviews of California's NPDES program (2008 final report, 2014 draft report). USEPA's current criticism of this approach is not new. More than 25 years ago, in the 1989 preamble to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) [NPDES rules governing water quality based permitting], responding to public comment requesting that whole effluent toxicity (WET) not be used as an enforceable effluent limit, USEPA stated: "EPA requires [WET] limits where necessary to meet water quality standards. EPA does not believe that a whole effluent toxicity trigger alone is fully effective because it does not by itself, restrict the quantity, rate, or concentrations of pollutants in an effluent." 54 Fed. Reg. 23868, 23875. Later, in response to comments on the Great Lakes Initiative (GLI) that permits should include monitoring with a TRE trigger and any limit should serve only as the objective for a TRE, USEPA replied: "While EPA agrees that TREs are valuable tools in identifying and eliminating whole effluent toxicity, EPA does not agree that TREs can be used as a substitute for WET limits in permits." The Regional Water Board concurs with USEPA's criticism of the "trigger" approach.</p> <p>USEPA's updated guidance regarding whole effluent</p>	

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>toxicity in the “National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document” (June 2010), describes the TST as a feasible method to implement effluent limitations. USEPA formally endorsed the TST as an improved hypothesis testing tool to evaluate data collected using WET methods following an extensive external peer review process. This approach has undergone a “test drive” in California and been published in peer reviewed toxicological journals. The TST improves understanding of the discharge condition by correctly identifying toxic and non-toxic samples more often than when using the NOEC-LOEC. The permit’s proposed numeric effluent limits for chronic toxicity, expressed in terms of the TST hypothesis test, unambiguously achieve the requirements for NPDES effluent limits under the CWA and its implementing regulations.</p> <p>Because of the availability of toxicity testing methods and applicable EPA guidance endorsing these methods, the Regional Water Board finds that numeric effluent limits for toxicity are both feasible and appropriate to protect water quality standards. This permit is not the first in the state to adopt a numeric effluent limitation for chronic toxicity, or to utilize the TST. (See, e.g., R9-2013-0026 (General NPDES Order for discharges from boatyards); R8-2012-0035 (NPDES Order for Orange County Sanitation District)). The State’s Ocean Plan also sets numeric limits for chronic toxicity that have been incorporated into NPDES permits as numeric effluent limitations. This Regional Water Board has already endorsed the TST is implementing it in the Los Angeles MS4 permit, NPDES wastewater permits, and individual industrial stormwater permits. With these actions, this Regional Water Board will fully integrate chronic toxicity testing programs and their results across the Region. A numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation utilizing the TST was also included in several NPDES permits for industrial facilities (Order No. R4-2013-0172 NPDES permit for the University of Southern California, adopted by the Regional Water Board</p>	

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
			<p>on November 7, 2013 and NPDES permit Order No. R4-2014-0033 NPDES permit for the Calleguas Municipal Water District Regional Salinity Management Pipeline). A numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation utilizing the TST was also included in several NPDES permits for inland POTWs in the San Gabriel River, Santa Clara River, and Calleguas Creek Watersheds.</p>	
SCAP	5	<p><u>Alternate Test Procedure (ATP)</u></p> <p>These proposed permit requirements all represent unpermitted and unauthorized modifications to the approved regulatory test methods for determining chronic toxicity contained in the 2002 Methods formally adopted by USEPA in 40 C.F.R. Part 136. When this Regional Board initially imposed the TST-related requirements, SCAP sued USEPA over their approval of an at that time approved Alternate Test Procedure (ATP) in California allowing these modifications. As a result of that limitation, USEPA withdrew the ATP, making use of the TST-related requirements unlawful. These requirements also violated the Los Angeles Region's Basin Plan, which requires effluent limits for the constituents causing toxicity, not limits for chronic toxicity. For these reasons, the currently proposed chronic toxicity requirements should be removed from the WRPs' permits.</p>	<p>The Order is consistent with the letter dated February 11, 2015, from USEPA to the State Water Resources Control Board withdrawing approval of the alternate test procedure using a two-concentration test design. As written, the Order requires the test methods described in Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms (October 2002) (EPA-821-R-02-013), including a multi-concentration test design, when required.</p> <p>Use of the TST was not deemed unlawful when USEPA withdrew its ATP. What was discontinued was the sole use of a two-concentration test design for NPDES effluents evaluated for chronic toxicity using some 2002 WET methods.</p>	None necessary.
SCAP	6	<p><u>Pending SCAP petition& lawsuits</u></p> <p>SCAP has appealed other NPDES permits from this region and has filed another suit against USEPA for using and approving of the use of TST-related requirements. The Regional Board should abstain from using these requirements until all of these appeals and challenges have been resolved. Otherwise, Regional Board staff resources will be wasted if the permits all need to be revised later.</p>	<p>The Donald C. Tillman WRP Order is consistent with other NPDES permits adopted for POTWs by this Regional Water Board. Section VI.C.1.k contains a reopener provision which would allow for the permit to be reopened and modified to revise any and all of the chronic toxicity testing provisions and effluent limitations, to the extent necessary, to be consistent with any Toxicity Plan that is subsequently adopted by the State Water Board promptly after USEPA approval of such Plan.</p>	None necessary.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
Comments received from United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) on February 6, 2017				
USEPA	1	<p><u>Water Quality-based Effluent Limits</u></p> <p>We agree with the reasonable potential determinations and proposed effluent limits for non-TMDL conventional, non-conventional and toxic pollutants. As with the previous permits and the U.S. EPA-approved copper and ammonia-nitrogen TMDL provisions for these POTWs, we support the proposed water quality-based effluent limits (WQBELs) for copper and ammonia-nitrogen. The fact sheets document how, during this permit term, the proposed WQBELs for copper and ammonia-nitrogen will plainly and clearly maintain and improve water quality in these reaches of the Los Angeles River watershed by protecting water quality standards (aquatic life objectives and anti-degradation) both during wet weather periods and when in-stream flows are dominated by effluent discharges from these POTWs. In conjunction, we believe that the anti-backsliding and anti-degradation analyses routinely conducted by permit writers during NPDES permit reissuance gives the Regional Water Board flexibility to consider additional information that may lead to less stringent WQBELs for these TMDL pollutants in subsequent permits.</p>	The Regional Water Board staff thank USEPA for supporting this permit.	None necessary.
		<p>During review of the D.C. Tillman draft permit, we noted a few provisions that should be clarified or corrected in the final permit. Order Table 2, Attachments B-1, B-2 and C, and fact sheet section II.B should be updated to clarify the physical location of each authorized NPDES discharge point. The fact sheet's calculations for the ammonia-nitrogen MDEL (page F-37) and proposed MDEL (Table F-8) should be cross-walked and clarified. The fact sheet's reasonable potential analysis for cadmium should be clarified; a dry weather WQBEL for cadmium is required if the reported maximum effluent</p>	<p>Regional Water Board staff revised Table 2, Attachment B-1, Attachment B-2, and section II.B of the Fact Sheet.</p> <p>There were no adjustments or application of MOSF to the MDEL. The calculated MDEL on page F-37 of the tentative permit is 6.4 mg/L. However, the transcribed "Maximum Daily" was in error and it should have been 6.4 mg/L instead of 5.6 mg/L The final effluent limitation (MDEL) for ammonia nitrogen shall be corrected in Table 4 of the Order and elsewhere in the permit.</p> <p>The footnotes in Table 4 will replicate the metals footnotes</p>	Revisions were made to the permit.

Commenter	Comment #	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		concentration (13 ug/l) is a dry weather measurement that exceeds the applicable water quality criterion. For consistency and clarity, we recommend revising Order Table 4 footnote 10 to read as footnote 10 for wet weather in the L.A. Glendale and Burbank orders.	used in LAGWRP and Burbank orders.	