



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

This matrix references all the comments received regarding the EWMP in the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board letter dated October 27, 2015. For each individual comment, the matrix includes a response describing, if necessary, how it has been addressed, and the status.

Summary of Comments of the MCW EWMP from LA Regional Board dated 10/27/15 & Response to Comments

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
General Comments					
1			<p>There are inconsistencies between the EWMP and CIMP. The EWMP and the CIMP must align. The following, but not limited to, are inconsistencies between the EWMP and the CIMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 10 (EWMP) and Table 3 (CIMP) - Malibou Lake and Lindero Lake responsibility • Tables 11 and 12 (EWMP) and Table 5 (CIMP) - Category 3 Pollutants 	1/22/16	Table 10 (new Table 12), 11 (new Table 13), and 12 (new Table 15) were updated to be consistent with the CIMP.
2			<p>Although, Malibu Beach and Malibu Lagoon Beach lay outside of the EWMP Watershed boundaries, the MCW Group members are subject to the requirements of the SMB Beaches Bacteria TMDL in Attachment M, subpart A. See Regional Water Board letter dated October 28, 2003 and CIMP comment. Section 3.1 (TMDL) and all</p>	1/22/16	The EWMP has been revised to include the SMB Beaches Bacteria TMDL. Timing for compliance SMB Beaches Bacteria TMDL is interim compliance 2018 (50% wet weather) and final compliance is 2021 (100% wet weather), which is the same date as the Malibu



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			other applicable portions of the EWMP must be revised to include SMB Beaches Bacteria TMDL requirements.		Creek Bacteria TMDL. The EWMP was updated to incorporate a section on the SMB Bacteria TMDL and the impact of stakeholders and compliance requirements.
3	Table 10 (page 16-18)		In Table 10, which summarizes the 2010 303(d) listings for the Malibu Creek Watershed, state the name of the TMDL that addresses the pollutant listed.	1/22/16	The name of the of the TMDL in column 3 for those pollutants with TMDLs developed has been included in the new Table 12.
4	Section 6.2.3.1 (page 67)		Correct water year between “200 and 2010” to “2000 and 2010.”	1/22/16	The typo has been corrected to correctly state 2000.
5	Section 2.1.2		Provide an explanation of why proposals to divert flows to the LVMWD system and stormwater harvest and use projects in cooperation with LVMWD were determined to be infeasible.	1/22/16	The text has been updated to provide the explanation provided by LVMWD that these proposals were determined to not be feasible at this time due to LVMWD concerns on treatment plant capacity and impacts to their NPDES discharge permit.
Water Quality Characterization					
6		Part VI.C.5.a.i (page 60)	The revised EWMP shall include characterization of stormwater and non-stormwater discharges from the MS4 as well as receiving water quality to	1/22/16	Data to characterize stormwater and non-stormwater discharges was not available during development of the EWMP. In



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<p>support identification and prioritization/sequencing of management actions, to the extent possible based on available data.</p> <p>In addition, the revised EWMP shall include a description of what data was used to characterize water quality, particularly in regard to Section 3.3 and Table 11. This could be addressed by reproducing Table 5 of the EWMP Work Plan, and indicating which of the monitoring programs/year(s) data collected were used to identify Category 3 pollutants. The EWMP must also provide justification for using median concentrations and only considering pollutants with a minimum of five samples collected over the data period to identify Category 3 pollutants.</p> <p>Furthermore, the revised EWMP shall show the monitoring stations used to characterize water quality and derive the list of Category 3 pollutants, and shall discuss whether the locations are adequately representative of the</p>		<p>compliance with the CIMP, the stakeholders will be collecting data to characterize these. Figure 2 of the Work Plan with all monitoring sites (including Category 3 pollutant monitoring sites) used to derive the list of Category 3 pollutants was developed. The sites where the Category 3 sites were located are identified by pollutant-site-waterbody combination are listed in the table and can be cross-referenced in the map in Chapter 4. Table 5 from the EWMP Work Plan was added to the document as new Table 14 and the information about program and period of collection was added.</p> <p>Justification for the use of median and the minimum of five samples was added under section 3.3.</p> <p>Section 3.1.4 has been updated with a current status of trash</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<p>waterbodies within the MCW (for receiving water data) and of Permittees' MS4 discharges (for stormwater/non-stormwater discharge data). This could be addressed using Figure 2 from the EWMP Work Plan, or a modification of that figure, as appropriate (i.e., to show only the monitoring stations used to identify Category 3 pollutants).</p> <p>The revised EWMP must indicate if the current compliance requirement of 60% trash reduction as of July 7, 2015 is currently being met; if not, the EWMP must indicate the current status of compliance with the required trash reductions per the Trash TMDL and actions to achieve compliance.</p>		<p>reduction for each of the MCW EWMP jurisdictions.</p>
7	Table 10 (page 16-18), Section 6.2.3 Table 33 (page 69)	Part VI.C.5.a.ii.(2) (page 60)	Table 10, which summarizes the 2010 303(d) listings for the Malibu Creek Watershed incorrectly identifies the following Category 2 Pollutants as "TMDL Developed." Correct the EWMP to reflect that the following water body pollutant combinations do not have a TMDL:	1/22/16	<p>Table 10 (new Table 12) was revised as requested. Per discussion with Regional Board staff Lake Sherwood is not in the MCWEWMP area</p> <p>Table 33 (new Table 36) has been revised with a recalculation of</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malibu Creek-Fish Barriers (Fish Passage) • Malibu Creek-Invasive Species <p>Further, Table 10 does not include Lake Sherwood, which is on the 303(d) list as impaired due to mercury, and is addressed by the LA Lakes TMDLs established by USEPA. Add Lake Sherwood to Table 10. The Group may note, as USEPA found in its TMDL, that there are no MS4 discharges to Lake Sherwood.</p> <p>Receiving water limitations for category 2 pollutants do not appear to be clearly listed in the EWMP. The revised EWMP must clearly list the applicable receiving water limitations for the Category 2 pollutants.</p> <p>Section 6.2.3, Table 33 (page 69) identifies the targets for priority water quality pollutants in the MCW for lead, mercury, selenium, and sulfate. The</p>		<p>the target for lead based on a maximum hardness of 400 mg/L and updated incorrect footnote reference.</p> <p>Provided in Appendix 8 is the Receiving Water Limitations applicable to the Malibu Creek Watershed. This table consistent with the table provided in the CIMP.</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<p>target calculated for lead based on a hardness of 730 mg/L exceeds the maximum hardness of 400 mg/L as defined by the California Toxics Rule. The revised EWMP shall recalculate the target for lead based on a maximum hardness of 400 mg/L. Also, in Table 33, it appears that note 4 may be incorrectly associated with the lead dry weather target for RAA.</p>		
8	<p>Table 12 (page 23) Table 11 (page 19)</p>	<p>Part VI.C.5.a.ii.(3) (page 60)</p>	<p>In Table 12, Cheseboro Creek is missing phosphate as P. In the MCW CIMP, chloride is listed as a Category 3 pollutant in Cheseboro Creek. However, chloride is not identified as a pollutant in Table 11 or in Table 12 within the EWIMP and no justification is provided for not including chloride as a Category 3 pollutant. Provide a justification for not including chloride as a Category 3 pollutant or list chloride within Table 11 and 12 in the revised EWMP.</p>	1/22/16	<p>Phosphate as P was added to Table 12 (new Table 15). Chloride was added as a category 3 pollutant in Table 11 (new Table 13) & Table 12 (new Table 15).</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
Source Assessment					
9		Part VI.C.5.a.iii.(1)(a)(i)-(iv) (pages 59-60)	The EWMP must make findings from the Permittee(s)' IC/IDE programs, Industrial/Commercial Facilities Pollutant Control programs, Development Construction programs, Public Agency Activities programs regarding known and suspected stormwater and non-stormwater pollutant sources in discharges to the MS4 and from the MS4 to receiving waters and any other stressors related to MS4 discharges causing or contributing to the water quality priorities. If no relevant information was collected from a review of these programs, the EWMP should clearly state so.	1/22/16	Section 3.4 Source Assessment has been added to the document and it identifies that based on review of data that no specific pollutant sources have been identified in the Malibu Creek Watershed for the MCW EWMP Group jurisdictions.
10		Part VI.C.5.a.iii.(1)(a)(v) (page 61)	The EWMP must clearly include data and conclusions from TMDL source investigations regarding known and suspected stormwater and non-stormwater pollutant sources in	1/22/16	Section 3.4 Source Assessment has been added to the document and it identifies that currently non-stormwater outfall screening source investigations are underway but based on current source investigations there are



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			discharges to the MS4 and from the MS4 to receiving waters.		no known and suspected stormwater and non-stormwater pollutant sources in discharges to the MS4 and from the MS4 to receiving waters for the Malibu Creek Watershed.
11		Part VI.C.5.a.iii.(1)(a)(vi) (page 61)	The EWMP must include data and conclusions from watershed model results regarding known and suspected stormwater and non-stormwater pollutant sources in discharges to the MS4 and from the MS4 to receiving waters.	1/22/16	Appendix 6A includes model results that indicate the amount of surface runoff and pollutant loads from urban areas. Figure 6A-1 and 6A-19 of the appendix present the amount of surface runoff (in acre feet and inches per acre) from various urban (MS4) and non-MS4 (e.g., horse facilities) areas. Figures 6A-20 through 6A-23 present unit-area pollutant loads from various land uses in the watershed, which discharge to the MS4 and from the MS4 to receiving waters.
12		Part VI.C.5.a.iii.(1)(a)(vii) (page 61)	The EWMP must include data and conclusions from Permittee(s)' monitoring programs regarding known and suspected stormwater and non-stormwater pollutant sources in	1/22/16	Data to characterize stormwater and non-stormwater discharges was not available during development of the EWMP. In compliance with the CIMP, the



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			discharges to the MS4 and from the MS4 to receiving waters.		stakeholders will be collecting data to characterize these.
13		Part VI.C.5.a.iii.(1)(b) (page 61)	The EWMP must include a map(s) of the Permittee(s)' MS4, including all major outfalls and major structural controls for stormwater and non-stormwater. Some of the maps included in the CIMP may fulfill this purpose in part (i.e., Figures 8-11 include storm drains and open channels, but do not appear to include major MS4 outfalls and major structural controls).	1/22/16	Maps have been updated to include available information regarding major outfalls and structural controls for stormwater and non-stormwater.
Selection of Watershed Control Measures					
14		Part VI.C.5.a.iv.(1) (page 61)	The Malibu Creek Bacteria TMDL compliance deadline for dryweather has passed. The MCW EWMP Group requested a TSO, but a TSO has not yet been issued by the Regional Board. The revised EWMP must specify a strategy to implement pollutant controls necessary to achieve water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations for E. coli during dry weather.	1/22/16	- Language has been added to Section 5.3.2 Institutional and Source Control BMPs to identify that the institutional and source controls specified in the section, the Non-stormwater control measures in Section 7.4 in addition to structural BMPs that are constructed serve as the elements of the strategy to achieve water quality-based effluent limitations and receiving



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
					limitations for E. coli during dry weather to assist in achieving compliance with the Malibu Creek Bacteria TMDL.
15	Table 17 (page 26)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(1)(a)(iii) (page 63)	No modifications to the Development Construction Program are proposed; however, the EWMP does not explicitly state that the provisions in the Los Angeles County MS4 Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075 shall be implemented. The EWMP must be revised to explicitly state whether the Program will be revised or implemented as written in the LA County MS4 Permit.	1/22/16	Language stating that the Development Construction Program will be implemented as written in the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075). has been added to Section 5.1.1, just above Table 20.
16	Table 15 (page 25)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(1)(a)(ii) (page 63)	No modifications to the Industrial/Commercial Facilities Program are proposed; however, the EWMP does not explicitly state that the provisions in the Los Angeles County MS4 Order No. R4-20120175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075 shall be implemented. In addition, there is a blank cell in Table 15: Industrial/Commercial Facilities	1/22/16	Language stating that the Industrial/Commercial Facilities Program will be implemented as written in the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075). has been added to Section 5.1.1, just above Table 18.



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			Program. The EWMP must be revised to explicitly state whether the Program will be revised or implemented as written in the LA County MS4 Permit.		
17	Table 19 (page 27)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(1)(a)(iii) (page 63)	No modifications to the Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharge Elimination Program are proposed; however, the EWMP does not explicitly state that the provisions in the Los Angeles County MS4 Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075 shall be implemented. The EWMP must be revised to explicitly state whether the Program will be revised or implemented as written in the LA County MS4 Permit.	1/22/16	Language stating that the the Illicit Connections and Illicit Discharge Elimination Program will be implemented as written in the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075). has been added to Section 5.1.1, just above Table 22.
18	Table 18 (Page 27)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(1)(a)(iv) (page 63)	No modifications to the Public Agency Activities Program are proposed; however, the EWMP does not explicitly state that the provisions in the Los Angeles County MS4 Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075 shall be implemented. The EWMP must be revised to explicitly state whether the	1/22/16	Language stating that the the Public Agency Activities Program will be implemented as written in the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075). has



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			Program will be revised or implemented as written in the LA County MS4 Permit.		been added to Section 5.1.1, just above Table 21.
19	Table 13 (Page 24-25)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(1)(a)(v) (page 63)	No modifications to the Public Information and Participation Program are proposed; however, the EWMP does not explicitly state that the provisions in the Los Angeles County MS4 Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 20150075 shall be implemented. The EWMP must be revised to explicitly state whether the Program will be revised or implemented as written in the LA County MS4 Permit.	1/22/16	Language stating that the the Public Information and Participation Program will be implemented as written in the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit (Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075). has been added to Section 5.1.1, just above Table 16.
20	Section 5.1 (page 24)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(1)(c) (page 63)	Through the EWMP, the MCW Permittees must implement the MCMs as set forth in the Los Angeles County MS4 Order No. R4-2012-0175 as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2015-0075, not those of the 2001 LA MS4 permit, which is referenced in Section 5.1.1. Section 5.1.1 and Tables 13-19 must be revised as necessary to reflect the MCMs that each Permittee will	1/22/16	Section 5.1.1 and tables 16-22 reflect the MCMs in the 2012 permit. Language was added to the beginning of 5.1.1 to clarify the new permit and requirements.



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			implement per the 2012 permit, as amended.		
21	Section 5.3.2 (page 32-36), Table 23, Table 28	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(4)(b)-(c) (page 64)	<p>Page 36, Section 5.3.2.3 states, “...the current street sweeping program will be enhanced with advanced sweeping technologies in residential areas that require additional pollutant reduction when the contract is re-bid.” The revised EWMP must state when each Permittee will complete its evaluation of the potential for enhanced street sweeping and also when the street sweeping contract is up for re-bid for each Permittee. The EWMP must also specify what advanced sweeping technologies or methods (e.g., conversion to regenerative air sweepers, reduced speed of street sweepers) will be applied to reduce pollutants.</p> <p>A more detailed description of the BMPs listed in Table 23: Matrix of Associated Pollutants for Enhanced Institutional and Source Controls is provided in Section 5.3.2 Institutional and Source</p>	1/22/16	<p>Dates for each of the permittees as to when the street sweeping contract will be implemented and which advanced street sweeping technologies will be used have been included.</p> <p>Increased Frequency of Catch Basin Cleaning and the Landscape/Gardner License Program were leftover information from a previous draft and will not be implemented as part of the EWMP and so have been deleted from Table 23 (new Table 26).</p> <p>Language has been updated to provide a more clear description of the proposed BMP at site MEC-12.</p> <p>Total volumes treated by all watershed control measures at various stages of implementation</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<p>Control BMPs (pages 32-36); however, a description of the Increased Frequency of Catch Basin Cleaning and the Landscape/Gardner License Program must be included within the EWMP.</p> <p>A more detailed description of the proposed streamflow treatment/retention facility to be located at site MEC-12 must be included in the revised EWMP, particularly for the alternative in which streamflow would be removed from the creek, treated and returned to the creek.</p> <p>The volume of stormwater to be retained by the combination of regional BMPs and green streets, at various stages of implementation within each subwatershed, must be included within the EWMP.</p> <p>Although in Section 5.3.3 the eight regional projects listed in Table 28 seem to be defined to capture the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event, the</p>		<p>within each subwatershed are included in Appendix 7C. Additional language has been added to the EWMP to discuss BMP capacities and reference to Appendix 7C within Section 5.3.3.2 of the EWMP.</p> <p>The revised EWMP has been modified to identify which of the planned regional projects will retain the volume associated with the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event.</p> <p>Additional discussions on retention volumes have been provided along with updates to Table 28 (new Table 31) which provide retention volumes for each of the Regional BMPs.</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<p>revised EWMP must specifically state if each of the planned regional projects will retain the volume associated with the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event, and all nonstormwater runoff and indicate what that volume is for each project’s tributary area. (Also include this information in Appendix A.) If the planned regional projects will not retain the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event, the EWMP must ensure that the reasonable assurance analysis addresses the tributary area.</p>		
22	Table 40 (page 96)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(4)(d) (page 64)	<p>Table 40: Proposed MCW EWMP Compliance Schedule lists compliance dates for TMDLs and proposes non-specific interim milestones to assess progress every two years. However, the revised EWMP must include more specific interim milestones and dates for completion, particularly for non-structural (institutional and source) control measures to ensure progress toward TMDL compliance deadlines. Further, there is inconsistency in the EWMP regarding final implementation</p>	1/22/16	<p>The compliance date in Section 7.2.1 has been revised to be December 2017. Interim milestones for the for all institutional controls have been added to Table 40 (new Table 43) in Section 7.2.1.</p> <p>Summary tables for Figures 35-39 (new Figures 36-40) for structural BMP capacities by assessment area, Permittee and compliance</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<p>of all institutional and source controls. Table 40 establishes a final compliance date of December 2017, while Section 7.2.1 indicates an implementation date of 2020. Rather than a single compliance date for all non-structural controls, provide dates specific to each action in Table 39, as indicated above.</p> <p>Finally, provide the interim milestones relative to structural BMP capacity in Figures 35-39 in a single table organized by assessment area, Permittee and compliance deadline.</p>		<p>deadline are provided in Appendix 7C.</p>
23	Table 23 Section 5.3.2 (pages 32-36)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(e) (page 65)	The responsible Permittees for each BMP proposed within Table 23: Matrix of Associated Pollutants for Enhanced Institutional and Source Controls must be specified.	1/22/16	Each of the permittees will be implementing each of the Institutional and Source Controls, except for those that are blank, which are not applicable to that jurisdiction, in Table 42. Language has been added to Section 7.2.1 to reflect this and interim milestones for the specific dates for all institutional controls to be completed have



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
					been added to Table 42 in section 7.2.1.
Enhanced Watershed Management Program Provisions					
24	Section 5.3.3 (page 38), Section 5.3.3.1.5 (page 44)	Part VI.C.1.g (page 49)	Regional BMPs are defined as multi-benefit regional projects. However, the Group does not specifically identify which selected Regional BMPs will retain the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event once the initial prioritization is completed. In section 5.3.3.1.5 the EWMP addresses that “this initial prioritization provided the baseline for identifying the sites with the greatest potential to retain the volume equivalent to the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event.” As commented above, the revised EWMP must identify which of the eight regional projects will retain the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event and all non-storm water runoff.	1/22/16	Of the Regional BMPs LVC-14 and TC-02 are designed to retain the 85 th percentile, 24-hour storm event water quality volume and all non-stormwater runoff. The other regional BMPs footprints are too small to retain the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event, due to such large tributary areas to these BMPs. A detailed discussion of this has been provided in Section 5.3.3.2.
25	Section 5.3.3.1.4 (page 44)		The EWMP states “...preliminary sizing was to maximize, site-bysite, the water quality benefits associated with implementing each BMP.” (Pg. 44) The	1/22/16	BMP volumes for each BMP have been provided in Table 29 and language has been added to Section 5.3.3.2 identifying that



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			revised EWMP must state for each regional BMP if the sizing of the regional BMP will meet the applicable water quality based effluent limitations and/or the water quality design volume (as commented above).		sizing of the regional BMP will meet the applicable water quality based effluent limitations.
26	Section 5.3.3.1.4	Part VI.C.1.g (page 49)	Section 5.3.3.1.4 of the EWMP, states “If site constraints prohibited retention, other BMPs were used, and the RAA was completed for the areas where retention is not feasible for the 90th percentile storm.” (page 44) However, the EWMP does not clearly identify the drainage areas where retention of the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event is not feasible. The revised EWMP needs to clearly identify the drainage areas within the watershed where retention of the 85th percentile 24hour storm event is feasible and is not feasible. For the drainage areas where it is not feasible, then the RAA must demonstrate that the proposed watershed control measures will achieve the water quality based effluent limitations and receiving water	1/22/16	Language has been added to Section 5.3.3.1.4 to identify that retention of the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm is feasible and is planned for the drainage areas of regional BMP sites TC-02 and LVC-14. For the other drainage areas of the watershed the RAA demonstrates that the proposed watershed control measures will achieve the water quality based effluent limitations and receiving water limitations.



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			limitations (as indicated in the quote above).		
27	Section 5.3.3.2	Part VI.C.1.g.iv. (page 49)	For each of the eight regional BMPs, the revised EWMP must elaborate on the other anticipated benefits the regional projects will achieve (e.g., flood control, water supply, flow reduction, open space, habitat, recreation, etc.).	1/22/16	The multiple benefits of all 8 regional BMPs have been identified in Table 31.
28	Section 5.3.3.1.3	Part VI.C. 1.g.v (page 49)	<p>A desktop survey using GIS and aerial imagery was used to identify public and private vacant parcels with nearby storm drains on fairly moderate to flat slopes and limited physical obstructions. Provide a map showing locations of the public/private, parcels considered.</p> <p>The revised EWMP must provide further explanation of the public/ private BMPs opportunities/incentives that will be offered to the public/private owners.</p>	1/22/16	After expressing the concerns and challenges with posting private parcel information in the EWMP the Regional Board understood the complexity. A discussion regarding the process for how each of the private parcels was selected and prioritized has been included in Section 5.3.3.1.5. Per discussion with the Regional Board a map of these parcels is no longer required.
29	Section 7.4 (page 95)	Part VI.C.1.g.viii (page 50)	The EWMP must state that existing requirements to comply with technology based effluent limitations and core requirements (e.g., prohibiting non-stormwater discharges of pollutants	1/22/16	A statement that existing requirements to comply with technology based effluent limitations and core



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			through the MS4 and controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater to the MEP) will not be delayed.		requirements will not be delayed has been added to Section 7.4.
30	Table 45, Section 8 (page 98), Table 46,	Part VI.C.1.g.ix (page 50)	<p>For each Permittee, the revised EWMP should state the amount of current monetary funds available for permit implementation.</p> <p>The EWMP should, where possible, identify potential sources of funds.</p> <p>The revised EWMP must specifically describe the financial strategy to secure funding in order to implement the BMPs proposed for the 2017 milestone, which is within the current permit cycle.</p>	1/22/16	Per discussion with Regional Board staff the use of general funds and potential grants are acceptable. The use of general funds is identified in Section 8.5.1 and the use of grants is identified in Section 8.5.2
31		Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(5)(c) (page 65)	The limiting pollutant selection in Section 6.2.4 and Table 35 does not address all Category 3 pollutants (e.g., TDS, specific conductivity, chloride). The EWMP must demonstrate that the BMPs proposed to address the limiting pollutants will also be sufficient to address all other Category 2 and	1/22/16	TDS and specific conductivity were the only Category 3 pollutants not included in Table 35 (new Table 38). Similar to sulfate and selenium, USEPA (2013) determined that sources of TDS and specific conductivity are naturally occurring in the watershed due to local geology.



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			Category 3 pollutants, or include additional BMPs and supporting analysis for the Categories 2 and 3 pollutants not addressed by the limiting pollutant analysis.		TDS and specific conductivity were added to Table 35 (new Table 38) consistent with approaches used to address selenium and sulfate.
32	Section 7.6 (pages 96-97)	Part VI.C.5.c (page 66)	<p>Section 7.6, Implementation Schedule shall incorporate the Trash compliance deadlines of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% Reduction - July 7, 2016 • 100% Reduction - July 7, 2017 <p>and the Bacteria TMDL Geometric Mean Deadline of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 15, 2021 <p>While the Regional Water Board has encouraged Permittees to look at previous TMDLs for milestone comparison, when assessing the timeline proposed in a TMDL the differences in waterbodies and impairments must be kept in mind. The sediment toxicity and associated benthic community impairments in the Dominguez Channel and Greater Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor Waters</p>	1/22/16	<p>The trash compliance deadlines and Bacteria TMDL Geometric Mean Deadline have been added to the implementation schedule (Table 43).</p> <p>No other TMDLs have been developed in the Los Angeles Region that address sedimentation and benthic community effects of an estuary, particularly a unique system such as a coastal lagoon. However, a sedimentation TMDL has been established in the San Diego Region for the Los Penasquitos Lagoon, which shares similar characteristics of the Malbu Creek Lagoon. The Los Penasquitos Lagoon TMDL includes a 20-year</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			Toxic Pollutants TMDL are not comparable to the sedimentation and benthic community impairments in MCW. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use such a comparison to justify the proposed final compliance date of 2032 in the MCW. Provide alternative justification and modify the proposed final compliance date accordingly.		implementation schedule to meet final wasteload allocations assigned to the Phase I MS4. Discussion of this similar TMDL and its associated implementation schedule was added to Section 7.6.
33	Section 9	Part VI.C.8 (pages 68-70)	Section 9 of the EWMP is unclear as to whether the adaptive management process will be completed every two years as required by the Permit or at the end of each Permit term. The revised EWMP must clarify the frequency of the adaptive management process.	1/22/16	The adaptive management process has been updated to include an adaptive management evaluation and modifications to the EWMP every two years.
Reasonable Assurance Analysis (RAA)					
34	Section 6 (page 58)	Part VI.C.5.b.iv.(5) (page 65)	The RAA needs to provide a discussion that non-stormwater discharges from the Permittees' MS4 are not causing or contributing to exceedances of water quality based effluent limitations or receiving water limitations. Alternatively, if nonstormwater	1/22/16	A statement that non-stormwater discharges from the Permittees' MS4 are not causing or contributing to exceedances of water quality based effluent limitations or receiving water



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			<p>discharges are causing or contributing to exceedances, the RAA must discuss the reasonable assurance that the BMPs proposed will adequately address the non-stormwater discharges.</p> <p>In addition, the revised EWMP needs to address the other comments provided in Enclosure 2.</p>		<p>limitations has been added to Section 6.4.3.</p>
Enclosure 2, comment 1	Section 3		<p>Section 3 Existing Water Quality Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include the effluent limits for total coliform, fecal coliform, and enterococcus for dry and wet weather listed on pages M-16 - 19 of the MS4 permit. • Include required interim and final water quality-based effluent limitations for trash as scheduled in the required annual trash reduction table on page M-20 of the permit. • Include in Section 3.1.5 on page 15 specific required reductions associated with the due dates as specified on page M-15 of the MS4 permit. 	1/22/16	<p>The effluent limits for total coliform, fecal coliform, and enterococcus, the interim and final water quality-based effluent limitations for trash, and the required reductions associated with the due dates as specified on page M-15 of the MS4 permit have been added to Section 3</p>



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
Enclosure 2, comment 2	Section 6.2.4		Table 35 on page 72 summarizes the Group’s limiting pollutant selection and justification for its RAA. For selenium, the EWMP states that selenium is naturally occurring in the MCW due to local geology (USEPA 2011). The Group needs to commit to reevaluate this conclusion through its CIMP and the adaptive management process.	1/22/16	A footnote that a special study for evaluating the natural sources of selenium in the watershed. Is proposed has been added to Table 35 (new Table 38). More detail about the special study has been added to Section 7.5
Enclosure 2, RAA modeling comment 1	RAA		The model results of water quality calibration for total sediment as shown in Table 32 indicate that the difference between modeled and observed values of total sediment is -35.8%. Note 2 to Table 32 states that bank erosion was not modeled in LSPC, and that shear stress will be used as a surrogate indicator for the sedimentation target. Provide additional explanation for the underestimation of modeled values for total sediment, identification of the data needed to improve model calibration for total sediment, and a commitment to collect the necessary data. Additionally, provide additional discussion of, and	1/22/16	Peak flow was used as a surrogate indicator of the sedimentation target, not shear stress as mistakenly reported in the table. Other RAA sections described the peak flow surrogate indicator appropriately, but Note 2 of Table 32 (new Table 35) was corrected. Section 6.4.1 was further modified to provide additional discussion of, and support for, peak flow as a surrogate indicator of the sedimentation target.



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
			support for, shear stress as a surrogate indicator for the sedimentation target.		The approach used in the RAA that is based on peak flow as a surrogate indicator is consistent with the linkage analysis used in the Benthic TMDL. The RAA does not recommend updating the model in the future to improve capability of simulating bank erosion or other sediment sources or transport processes not presently included within the LSPC model. The sediment calibration results provided in Table 32 (new Table 35), in addition to a new discussion provided in Section 6.2.1, are meant to demonstrate that the model should not be used for prediction of bank erosion and associated transport processes. As a result, the EWMP does not identify additional data needed to be collected in the future to improve model calibration.
Enclosure 2, RAA modeling	RAA		The EWMP separately defines critical conditions for the two categories of	1/22/16	As discussed in section 6.2.4, total phosphorus and E. coli were identified as limiting pollutants.



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions	Date	Response to Comment
comment 2			limiting pollutants, bacteria and nutrients. For nutrients, the critical condition is defined as the 90th percentile Exceedance Volume (EV) as explained in Section 6.2.3.1. Board staff understands that this “EV” approach provides assurance that the receiving water limitations (RWLs) will be met instream. Please also provide a comparison of the EV by assessment area with the 90th percentile of pollutant (total nitrogen and total phosphorus) load to account for conditions in which flow may be high but concentration may not exceed the RWL.		As such, control of phosphorus and E. coli has assurance of addressing the other MCW wet weather Water Quality priorities. Additional model results are presented in Appendix 6-C for total phosphorus that compares the 90 th percentile Exceedance Volume with the 90 th percentile load. Results were not presented for total nitrogen since total phosphorus is the limiting pollutant to address the Benthic TMDL.
Enclosure 2, RAA modeling comment 3	RAA		Please provide the model results for the baseline condition in terms of runoff volume, pollutant concentration and pollutant loading, as well as the estimated allowable loads and required load reductions, based on the 90th percentile critical condition of runoff	1/22/16	Additional RAA results for each assessment area are presented in Appendix 6-C.



DRAFT RESPONSE TO COMMENTS MATRIX – January 2016
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Comment Number	EWMP Reference	MS4 Permit Provision	Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions		Date	Response to Comment
			volume and pollutant concentration, for each modeled subbasin for each pollutant modeled.			
Enclosure 2, RAA modeling comment 4	RAA		Finally, please provide an example validation for a representative waterbody within the MCW or in another EWMP area that demonstrates that with all proposed BMPs in place, as determined from the initial analysis of the necessary volume and/or pollutant load reduction, will result in achieving the RWLs.			An example validation of the RAA approach is presented in Appendix 6-C. This example provides a validation of the RAA technical approach used for five EWMPs in the LA Region (Malibu Creek, Upper Santa Clara River, Upper Los Angeles River, Ballona Creek, Upper San Gabriel River), as well as the Carson and Lawndale portions of the Dominguez Channel EWMP.