

Regional Board Comment	Response
<p>1. The revised EWMP is not clear as to whether or not the four regional park projects will retain the storm water runoff from the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event for the drainage area tributary to the project. For example, Section 5.2.4.2.1 states, "The proposed infiltration units will be able to capture 100% of the park drainage area, plus an additional 3.9 acres of tributary drainage area." However, the EWMP does not indicate if this is the storm water volume associated with the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event. For the four regional park projects clearly state the storm water runoff volume from the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event and compare that volume to the design volume for these projects.</p>	<p>Each of the regional projects was designed to capture the 85th percentile storm size of 0.1ft. The text has been updated as requested.</p>
<p>2. Provide completion dates for the regional projects discussed in Section 5.2.3 and the four regional park projects discussed in Section 5.2.4.2.</p>	<p>Added completion dates</p>
<p>3. In Figure ES-4, Tables 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4 and throughout the EWMP, revise the schedules to include a month as well a year.</p>	<p>Added month (March)</p>
<p>4. In Section 5.2.4.2.4 the EWMP states that the Triangle Park project will capture and reuse runoff from a 0.5-acre tributary drainage area; however, Table 9-5 and Appendix B list the tributary drainage area as 0.05 acre. Revised the EWMP to reflect the correct tributary drainage area for the Triangle Park project.</p>	<p>The EWMP has been revised to show that the drainage area is 0.05 acres.</p>
<p>5. Section 3.2.1, the State Water Resources Control Board approved the second revision to the Ballona Creek Trash TMDL on November 17, 2015.</p>	<p>The text was updated as requested.</p>
<p>6. In Table 4-2 it appears that the waterbody, Ballona Lagoon/Venice Canal should probably be a new row.</p>	<p>Table formatted to show the separate row for Ballona Lagoon/Venice Canal</p>
<p>7. Verify the calculations in Table 5-10, it appears that the individual subwatershed areas (1A, 1B, 3 and 4) should sum up to the Total TMDL Area; however, the numbers do not add up.</p>	<p>Table updated.</p>
<p>8. Correct the title of Table 6-3: Stormwater Runoff Zinc Loading Calibration Summary.</p>	<p>Table header revised as requested.</p>
<p>9. In Tables 7-2 and 7-3, the existing Boone Olive Diversion BMP is not included as part of the Back Basins (Subwatersheds 1A, 3, 4). It is only listed under Subwatershed 3.</p>	<p>In Table 7-2, the percent reductions for the Back Basins (Subwatersheds 1A, 3, and 4) are calculated based on the volumes for the combined total of all three subwatersheds together. Each individual watershed load reduction calculation is based on volumes specific to that watershed, so the percentages for the subwatersheds will not add up to the percentages seen in the Back Basins section of the table. In Table 7-3, Boone</p>

	Olive is captured as an “additional BMP” in the back basins summary line. A footnote has been added to clarify.
<p>10. According to Table 7-3, “Additional BMPs” will be implemented in the Back Basins for a RAA Volume Reduction of 0.8 in 2016 and 0.5 in 2017. However, these volume reductions are not reflected in any of the Subwatersheds 1A, 3 or 4. Revised Table 7-3 to show where these volume reductions will be implemented.</p>	<p>The 1.3 acre-ft volume reduction for Boone Olive was inadvertently spread across multiple years, this has been updated in the table to reflect the 1.3 acre-ft of existing volume reduction for Boone Olive. All numbers in the table have been updated to reflect this update.</p>