

## Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

May 22, 2015

Beach Cities Watershed Management Group  
(See Distribution List)

### **REVIEW OF THE BEACH CITIES WATERSHED MANAGEMENT GROUP COORDINATED INTEGRATED MONITORING PROGRAM, PURSUANT TO ATTACHMENT E, PART IV.B OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEM (MS4) PERMIT (NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS004001; ORDER NO. R4-2012-0175)**

Dear Permittees of the Beach Cities Watershed Management Group:

The Regional Water Board has reviewed the draft monitoring program submitted on June 26, 2014 by the Beach Cities Watershed Management Group (Group). This monitoring program was submitted pursuant to the provisions of NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 (Order No. R4-2012-0175), which authorizes discharges from the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) operated by 86 municipal Permittees within Los Angeles County (hereafter, LA County MS4 Permit). The LA County MS4 Permit allows Permittees the option to develop and implement a coordinated integrated monitoring program (CIMP) that achieves the five Primary Objectives set forth in Part II.A of Attachment E and includes the elements set forth in Part II.E of Attachment E. These programs must be approved by the Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board.

The Regional Water Board has reviewed the Group's draft CIMP and has determined that, for the most part, the CIMP includes the elements set forth in Part II.E of Attachment E and will achieve the Primary Objectives set forth in Part II.A of Attachment E of the LA County MS4 Permit. However, some additions and revisions to the CIMP are necessary. The Regional Water Board's comments on the draft CIMP, including detailed information concerning necessary additions and revisions to the CIMP, are found in Enclosure 1 and Enclosure 2.

Please make the necessary additions and revisions to the CIMP, as identified in the enclosures to this letter, and submit the revised CIMP as soon as possible and no later than **July 6, 2015**. The revised CIMP must be submitted to [losangeles@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:losangeles@waterboards.ca.gov) with the subject line "LA County MS4 Permit – Revised Beach Cities Watershed Management Group CIMP" with a copy to [Ivar.Ridgeway@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Ivar.Ridgeway@waterboards.ca.gov) and [Erum.Razzak@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Erum.Razzak@waterboards.ca.gov).

Upon approval of the revised CIMP by the Executive Officer, the Group must prepare to commence its monitoring program within 90 days. If the necessary revisions are not made, the Group must comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E of the LA County MS4 Permit.

Until the Group's CIMP is approved by the Executive Officer, the monitoring requirements pursuant to Order No. 01-182 and Monitoring and Reporting Program CI 6948, and pursuant to approved TMDL monitoring plans shall remain in effect.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Erum Razzak of the Storm Water Permitting Unit by electronic mail at [Erum.Razzak@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Erum.Razzak@waterboards.ca.gov) or by phone at (213) 620-2095. Alternatively, you may also contact Mr. Ivar Ridgeway, Chief of the Storm Water Permitting Unit, by electronic mail at [Ivar.Ridgeway@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Ivar.Ridgeway@waterboards.ca.gov) or by phone at (213) 620-2150.

Sincerely,



Samuel Unger, P.E.  
Executive Officer

Enclosures:   Enclosure 1 – Summary of Comments and Required Revisions  
                  Enclosure 2 – Comments on Aquatic Toxicity Testing  
                  Beach Cities Watershed Management Group Distribution List

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

Enclosure 1 – Summary of Comments and Necessary Revisions to Draft CIMP

Beach Cities Watershed Management Group

| CIMP Reference | MRP Element/<br>Reference<br>(Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision  |
|----------------|---|---|
| <b>General</b> |   |   |
| Table 1        |   | Provide a further breakdown of jurisdictional land use within each of the three HUC-12 areas in addition to the land use percentages by jurisdiction for the entire EWMP area.  |
| Table 2        | Attachment N<br>Part E                      | <p>Please make the following corrections to Table 2 of the draft CIMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update table note ‘a’ with the effective date of July 2, 2014. Also, note that the compliance date of November 1, 2009 for attaining the winter dry weather WLAs was not altered in the revised TMDL.</li> <li>• Delete table note ‘b’ as the timeframes referenced in the note are not applicable to the WLAs assigned to MS4 discharges, since those WLAs are based on existing MS4 discharge conditions. Therefore, the need for time to achieve pollutant load reductions is not anticipated.</li> <li>• Dominguez Channel (including Torrance Lateral): Correct Toxicity, Total Copper, Total Lead, and Total Zinc interim wet weather compliance deadline from 3/23/2012 to 12/28/2012 (the effective date of the Order).</li> <li>• Dominguez Channel (including Torrance Lateral): Correct Total Lead effluent limitation (final wet weather) from 35.8 µg/L to 42.7 µg/L per Table in Section E.3.b.i.</li> <li>• The City of Torrance is subject to TMDLs for Dominguez Channel Estuary as per Attachment K, Table K-13 of the LA County MS4 Permit. As such, add Dominguez Channel Estuary and associated pollutants and compliance deadlines as set forth in Sections E.2.b, E.3.c and E.3.d to the Category 1 Highest Priority pollutants.</li> <li>• Dominguez Channel (including Torrance Lateral): Add Total Copper, Total Lead, and Total Zinc during dry weather conditions to Category 3 Medium Priority Pollutants per footnotes 6 and 7 on p. N-6.</li> <li>• Change “N/A” in the Compliance Deadline column for Category 2 and Category 3 pollutants to “TBD in EWMP,”</li> </ul> |

| CIMP Reference                                  | MRP Element/ Reference (Attachment E)      | Comment and Necessary Revision   |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | <p>since the EWMP must specify interim milestones and final deadlines for achieving any necessary reductions in these pollutants in MS4 discharges.</p>  |
| Table 4   | Attachment N Part E (page N-5)             | <p>Note that In addition to Tables K-2 and K-4, Table K-13 also identifies the specific waterbodies for which each MS4 Permittee within the Dominguez Channel and Greater LA and Long Beach Harbor Waters Watershed Management Area is assigned WLAs and associated monitoring requirements per the Toxics TMDL.</p> <p>Please make the following corrections to Table 4 of the draft CIMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add Zinc for Torrance Carson Channel (Torrance Lateral)</li> <li>• Add Dominguez Channel Estuary (unlined portion below Vermont Ave.) and associated pollutants as in comment on Table 2, above.</li> </ul> |
| Section 11.1.1                                  |  | <p>Section 11.1.1 of the draft CIMP states that monitoring data will be submitted to <a href="mailto:MS4stormwaterRB4@waterboards.ca.gov">MS4stormwaterRB4@waterboards.ca.gov</a>. Please note that the aforementioned email address is no longer active. Instead, all monitoring data and/or other submissions should be sent to <a href="mailto:losangeles@waterboards.ca.gov">losangeles@waterboards.ca.gov</a> with the subject line "LA County MS4 Permit – Beach Cities WMG Monitoring Data."</p>  |
| Sections 11.1.1 and 11.2                        | Attachment G Part VIII (page G-17 to G-18) | <p>The semi-annual analytical data submittal and the Integrated Monitoring Compliance Report (IMCR) mentioned in the draft CIMP must also include a summary of exceedances of municipal action levels (MAL) for stormwater outfall samples.</p>  |
| Section 11.2                                    | Attachment G Part VIII                     | <p>Note that the IMCRs may serve as MAL Assessment Reports provided that the IMCRs include an assessment of the stormwater outfall data as compared to MALs. Additionally, the IMCRs in conjunction with the EWMP may meet the requirement for a MAL Action Plan if the EWMP addresses the waterbody-pollutant combination(s) for which the MAL(s) was exceeded, or where the Group requests modifications to its EWMP to address the MAL exceedances.</p>   |
| Appendix D Section D.2.1.4, Sections 4.2 and 12 | Part VIII.C (page E-23)                    | <p>Appendix D Section D.2.1.4 of the draft CIMP states that grab samples will be collected during dry weather and composite samples will be collected during wet weather. Include the specific procedure that will be used to collect composite samples during wet weather (i.e., number of aliquots, frequency of aliquot collection, and duration of sample collection).</p> <p>Sections 4.2 and 12 state that grab sampling will be used for stormwater outfall sampling; this is inconsistent with Appendix D, Section D.2.1.4. Revise Sections 4.2 and 12, and other sections of</p>  |

| CIMP Reference                    | MRP Element/ Reference (Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision  |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                   |                                       | <p>the draft CIMP as necessary, to state that composite sampling will be conducted at stormwater outfall locations.</p> <p>Clarify that composite sampling will also be used at the existing receiving water mass emission station, S28, in Dominguez Channel. If composite sampling will not be used at the two SMB receiving water monitoring sites, provide justification for the use of grab samples at these two locations.</p>  |
| <b>Receiving Water Monitoring</b> |                                       |   |
| Section 2.3.1                     |                                       | <p>In this section, the draft CIMP references a SMB Toxics TMDL, while elsewhere the TMDL is referenced as the SMB DDTs and PCBs TMDL. The latter title is the correct one and should be used throughout the CIMP for accuracy and consistency.</p>   |
|                                   | Part VI.A.1.b.ii (page E-14)          | <p>The revised CIMP must provide an explanation of how monitoring at the proposed receiving water stations RW-BCEG-1 and RW-BCEG-2 will provide representative measurement of the effects of the Group's MS4 discharges on Santa Monica Bay, given the proposed distance of the sites offshore. The Regional Water Board recommends that the Group considers locating these two receiving water sites closer to the shore where the impacts from the MS4 discharges if any, would be more detectable.</p>               |
| Section 2.2.3                     |                                       | <p>The draft CIMP in Section 2.2.3 states that to satisfy receiving water monitoring requirements for the SMBBBB TMDL, eleven existing monitoring sites will continue to be monitored. Include in the revised CIMP, a presentation and evaluation of observational data from sites O-06, O-07 and O-08, shown in Figure 7. On this basis of this evaluation, include weekly bacteriological monitoring at these sites, if the evaluation indicates significant non-stormwater discharges at any of these locations.</p> |
| Section 2.3.1                     |                                       | <p>The draft CIMP proposes weekly monitoring at shoreline sites, SMB-6-3 and SMB-6-4, and justifies this frequency on the basis of a year-round low flow diversion at SMB-6-3 and no MS4 discharge at SMB-6-4. This is acceptable. However, should conditions change at either of these sites such that there is a significant non-stormwater discharge from a MS4 then the sampling frequency must be re-evaluated.</p>  |
| Section 2.2.3                     |                                       | <p>The draft CIMP in Section 2.2.3 states that attainment of the Santa Monica Bay DDTs and PCBs TMDL (SMB DDT &amp; PCB TMDL) will be addressed through the stormwater outfall monitoring to assess the sediment borne loading of DDT and PCBs from the MS4 to SMB. This is an appropriate approach. However, as indicated in Section 4.2 and Table 8, the Group proposes to monitor the four</p>   |

| CIMP Reference | MRP Element/ Reference (Attachment E)                    | Comment and Necessary Revision   |
|----------------|--|--|
|                |  | <p>stormwater outfall sites in the SMB Watershed Management Area (WMA) in alternating years such that no one outfall site will be monitored every year within the SMB WMA. Given that compliance with the WLAs for DDT and PCBs is determined based on a three-year average, describe how the data from alternating sites will be adequate to assess compliance with these WLAs.</p> <p>The draft CIMP also states in Section 2.3.1 that the two SMB receiving water sites have been selected as the monitoring sites for the SMB DDT and PCBs TMDL and that three wet-weather sampling events will be conducted to evaluate the annual WLA of DDT and PCB for the Group. This sampling is not necessary. The TMDL monitoring requirements can be adequately fulfilled by stormwater outfall monitoring.</p> |
| Section 2.3.2  |  | <p>The draft CIMP establishes the thresholds for wet weather sampling of the two SMB receiving water sites in Section 2.3.2. In this section, however, there is a caveat that the monitoring event will qualify as a wet weather event, "provided that sufficient sample volume is collected to do all required laboratory analysis." Since samples are being collected from Santa Monica Bay, collecting an adequate sample volume should not be problematic. Please delete this caveat.</p>  |
|                | Part VI (page E-13 to E-17)                              | <p>The revised CIMP should include receiving water monitoring at the Torrance Lateral. Alternatively, the revised CIMP must include justification for not monitoring in Torrance Lateral. A receiving water station in the same location as outfall OF-BCEG-7 seems appropriate.</p>   |
|                |  | <p>The revised CIMP should indicate if the City of Torrance is participating in the Coordinated Compliance &amp; Reporting Plan for Greater Harbor Waters Regional Monitoring Coalition, dated February 26, 2014 for the Dominguez Channel Estuary as per the Dominguez Channel and Greater Harbors Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor Waters Toxic Pollutants TMDL (Harbor Toxics TMDL).</p>   |
| Table 6        | Part VI.C.1.d (page E-15 to E-16) & VI.D.1.c (page E-17) | <p>The following is missing from Table 6 of the draft CIMP. Please include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mass Emissions station (S28), all parameters that are applicable to S28 (e.g. field parameters, pollutants addressed by an applicable TMDL, 303(d) listed pollutants, toxicity, etc.), and monitoring frequency of 3 wet weather and 2 dry weather events.</li> <li>• Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and Suspended-Sediment Concentration (SSC) for Dominguez Channel (because</li> </ul>   |

| CIMP Reference            | MRP Element/<br>Reference<br>(Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision   |
|---------------------------|---|--|
|                           |   | turbidity is on the 303(d) list for Dominguez Channel).  |
| Table 6                   | Part VI.C.1.e<br>(page E-16)                | Table 6 of the revised CIMP should specify that Table E-2 parameters will be monitored during the first significant rain event of the storm year and during the critical dry weather event where dry weather sampling is conducted (i.e., S28) (preferably using a footnote).  |
| Table 6                   |   | <p>Correct table note '1', which states "3/0 signifies three wet weather and two dry weather events per year."</p> <p>Fill in the field parameters that will be collected at ocean receiving water sites in table note '2'.</p> <p>Clarify table note '4', which states that future monitoring will be conducted at the frequency specified in the MRP (i.e., ... 3/2). The Regional Water Board assumes that the Group proposes a sampling frequency of 3/0 for the two SMB receiving water sites and 3/2 for the Dominguez Channel receiving water site (S28).</p>   |
| Section 2.3.3             | Part VI.D<br>(page E-16 to E-17)            | The draft CIMP in Section 2.3.3 states that Low Flow Diversions (LFDs) divert all dry-weather flows from the storm drains to the sanitary sewer system keeping dry-weather flows from reaching Santa Monica Bay. Therefore, no dry weather conditions are specified. However, the CIMP should specify dry weather conditions for other receiving water sites (e.g., S28) as per Attachment E Part VI.D of the LA County MS4 Permit.  |
| Appendix A<br>Section 3.7 |   | <p>In Appendix A Section 3.7, the draft CIMP states, "[a]s recognized by the footnote in Attachment K-4 of the Permit, the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and the cities of Redondo Beach, Torrance, and Manhattan Beach have entered into an Amended Consent Decree with the United States and the State of California, including the Regional Board, pursuant to which the Regional Board has released the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and the cities of Redondo Beach, Torrance, and Manhattan Beach from responsibility for toxic pollutants in the Dominguez Channel and the Greater Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors."</p> <p>This statement misinterprets the Regional Water Board's findings. Footnote 1 to Table K-4 of the LA County MS4 Permit states, "[t]he requirements of this Order to implement the obligations of this TMDL do not apply to a Permittee to the extent that it is determined that the Permittee has been released from that obligation pursuant to the Amended Consent Decree entered in</p> |

| CIMP Reference                    | MRP Element/ Reference (Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision  |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                   |                                       | <p>United States v. Montrose Chemical Corp., Case No. 90-3122 AAH (JRx).” As stated in the responses to comments received on the Dominguez Channel and Greater Harbor Waters Toxic Pollutants TMDL, “...primarily one pollutant, DDT, is associated with the Superfund site and also addressed by the TMDL. The TMDL addresses numerous pollutants and utilizes a different process than Superfund. The other pollutants – heavy metals, PAHs, PCBs and other legacy pesticides are not within Superfund’s focus at the Montrose OU2 Site...”</p> <p>Furthermore, the WQBELs in Attachment N, Part E of the LA County MS4 Permit are for ongoing discharges from the MS4, not for the historic contamination of the bed sediments. Therefore, the statement in the draft CIMP incorrectly concludes that the aforementioned Consent Decree releases MS4 Permittees from any obligation to implement the WQBELs in the MS4 permits. This statement in the CIMP must be revised consistent with the comment above.</p>  |
| <p>Appendix A<br/>Section A.1</p> |                                       | <p>In Appendix A Section A.1, the draft CIMP implies that the Group will provide monitoring support for the Harbor Toxics TMDL. However, the draft CIMP does not address the compliance method or the monitoring requirements such as water column, sediment, and fish tissue monitoring.</p> <p>As per the Harbor Toxics TMDL, the CIMP must include and/or incorporate all the elements of a technically appropriate Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MRP) and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP). The CIMP must state that the Group will report compliance and non-compliance with waste load allocations (WLAs) as part of annual reports submitted to the Regional Water Board. In addition, the CIMP must include and/or incorporate elements of a QAPP which are protocols for sample collection, standard analytical procedures, and laboratory certification. All samples shall be collected in accordance with SWAMP protocols. For detailed requirements, refer to Basin Plan, Chapter 7, Section 7-40.1, “Monitoring Plan” (pages 22-24 of Attachment A of Resolution No. 11-008)</p> <p>Water and TSS samples shall be collected at the outlet of the storm drains discharging to Dominguez Channel, Dominguez Channel Estuary, and Torrance Lateral. Fish tissue and sediment samples should be collected in the receiving waters of the Dominguez Channel Estuary.</p> |

| CIMP Reference                      | MRP Element/ Reference (Attachment E)             | Comment and Necessary Revision  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                     |   | <p>The cities of Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach, and Torrance and the LACFCD are responsible for conducting water column monitoring, and the City of Torrance and LACFCD are additionally responsible for conducting sediment and fish tissue monitoring in Dominguez Channel Estuary. However, the Regional Water Board encourages the Group to consider collaborating or coordinating their efforts with other responsible parties as identified in the Harbor Toxics TMDL and/or WMP/EWMP Groups such as the Dominguez Channel Watershed Management Area Group to avoid duplication and reduce associated costs.</p> |
| Appendix A Table A-1 & A-2          | Attachment M Part A.3 (page M-1)                  | Appendix A Table A-1 and Table A-2 of the CIMP are redundant. Please remove one of the tables and reference the revised Santa Monica Bay Beaches Bacteria TMDL (July 2, 2014).  |
| Appendix A                          | Attachment M Table M-2 (page M-8)                 | <p>Appendix A Table A-4 of the draft CIMP gives maximum allowable exceedance days during wet weather which are specified in Attachment M Table M-1 of the LA County MS4 Permit.</p> <p>Note that Attachment M Table M-2 and not Table M-1 of the LA County MS4 Permit is currently in effect. Therefore, as per the revised Santa Monica Bay Beaches Bacteria TMDL (July 2, 2014), please include the maximum exceedance days beyond those allowed during wet weather as specified in Attachment M Table M-2 of the LA County MS4 Permit.</p>   |
| Appendix A Table A-16, A-19, & A-20 |   | Instead of listing all the effluent limitations for all the waterbodies covered by the Harbors Toxics TMDL, Appendix A Table A-16, A-19, and A-20 should list only those effluent limitations for the waterbody that is applicable to the Group. Only Dominguez Channel Estuary in these tables is applicable to the Beach Cities Group.  |
| Appendix A Table A-5 & A-6          |   | <p>Please make the following corrections to Appendix A Table A-5 and A-6 of the draft CIMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footnote 1 revision: Values in parentheses apply upon the effective date of the revised Santa Monica Bay Beaches Bacteria TMDL (July 2, 2014).</li> </ul>  |
| Appendix A Table A-15               | Attachment N Part E.3.a.ii, footnote 6 (page N-6) | In addition to the effluent limitations in Table A-15 of the draft CIMP, note that samples collected from outfalls during flow conditions less than the 90th percentile of annual flow rates must demonstrate that the acute and chronic hardness dependent water quality criteria (for copper, lead and zinc) provided in the California Toxics Rule (CTR) are achieved (see Attachment N Part E.3.a.ii, footnotes 6 and 7 of the LA County MS4 Permit).   |

| CIMP Reference           | MRP Element/ Reference (Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision  |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Appendix A Table A-18    |                                       | Appendix A Table A-18 of the draft CIMP lists the sediment effluent limitation for Lead as 35.6 mg/kg. It should be corrected to 35.8 mg/kg.  |
| Appendix A Section A.1.3 |                                       | <p>Requirements for the Santa Monica Bay Nearshore and Offshore Debris TMDL (SMB Debris TMDL) can be satisfied through the submittal of the Trash Monitoring and Reporting Plan (TMRP) and Plastic Pellet Monitoring and Reporting Plan (PMRP) or via the CIMP. Appendix A Section A.1.3 notes which cities have submitted a TMRP, PMRP, and/or a demonstration that a PMRP is not required. Based on a preliminary review by Regional Board staff, please see comments below:</p> <p><u>Redondo Beach:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On page 12 of the TMRP, the Methodology proposes a 40-ft swath. However, on page 13 under Specific Procedures, the Site Definition section states that a 20-foot section of the shoreline will be analyzed. The SWAMP Rapid Trash Assessment protocol calls for a 100-ft transect to be assessed. Please revise the TMRP to be consistent with the Rapid Trash Assessment protocol, and provide clarity.</li> <li>• In the PMRP, the map in Attachment B is unclear on the types of business/industries in the City. Please submit a list of corresponding SIC codes for these businesses.</li> </ul> <p><u>Torrance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SMB Debris TMDL lists an 80% reduction milestone in Year 7 (2019). However, the TMRP specifies that 77% of the WLA will be met for Year 7. The City of Torrance should implement additional and/or enhanced institutional controls to meet the 80% reduction in Year 7.</li> <li>• The City of Torrance submitted a request to the Regional Water Board to be exempt from the SMB Debris TMDL requirement to submit and implement a PMRP. The Regional Water Board has reviewed the documentation submitted, which included a spill response plan, and has determined that the City of Torrance does not have industrial facilities or activities related to the manufacturing, handling, or transportation of plastic pellets. Therefore, the City of Torrance is not required to monitor for plastic pellets, but will implement their spill response plan if necessary.</li> </ul> |

| CIMP Reference | MRP Element/ Reference (Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision  |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|---|
|                |                                       | <p><u>Hermosa Beach:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As stated in the SMB Debris TMDL, if within three (3) years of Regional Board adoption date (November 4, 2010) of this TMDL, a city or county voluntarily adopts local ordinances to ban plastic bags, smoking in public places and single use expanded polystyrene food packaging, it shall receive a three-year extension of the final compliance date. As per the TMRP submitted, the City of Hermosa Beach adopted and implemented bans on smoking in public places and polystyrene food service ware prior to November 4, 2013. Since there was no plastic bag ban implemented prior to November 4, 2013, the City of Hermosa Beach does not qualify for a three-year extension of the final compliance date. Therefore, the final compliance date for the City of Hermosa Beach is March 20, 2020 (8 years from the effective date of the TMDL).</li> <li>• The Regional Board has reviewed the TMRP and directs the City of Hermosa Beach to begin the implementation of the TMRP immediately.</li> <li>• The City of Hermosa Beach submitted a request to the Regional Water Board to be exempt from the SMB Debris TMDL requirement to submit and implement a PMRP. The Regional Water Board has reviewed the documentation submitted, which included a spill response plan, and has determined that the City of Hermosa Beach does not have industrial facilities or activities related to the manufacturing, handling, or transportation of plastic pellets. Therefore, the City of Hermosa Beach is not required to monitor for plastic pellets, but will implement their spill response plan if necessary.</li> </ul> <p><u>Manhattan Beach:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As stated in the SMB Debris TMDL, if within three (3) years of Regional Board adoption date (November 4, 2010) of this TMDL, a city or county voluntarily adopts local ordinances to ban plastic bags, smoking in public places and single use expanded polystyrene food packaging, it shall receive a three-year extension of the final compliance date. The City of Manhattan Beach adopted and implemented bans on plastic bags, smoking in public places, and polystyrene food service ware prior to November 4, 2013, and therefore a three-year extension</li> </ul> |

| CIMP Reference                                  | MRP Element/<br>Reference<br>(Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision   |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>of the final compliance date is appropriate. The new final compliance date for the City of Manhattan Beach is March 20, 2023 (11 years from the effective date of the TMDL). Please revise the TMRP to include the polystyrene food service ban implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Regional Board has reviewed the TMRP and directs the City of Manhattan Beach to begin the implementation of the TMRP immediately.</li> <li>• The City of Manhattan Beach submitted a request to the Regional Water Board to be exempt from the SMB Debris TMDL requirement to submit and implement a PMRP. The Regional Water Board has reviewed the documentation submitted, which included a spill response plan, and has determined that the City of Manhattan Beach does not have industrial facilities or activities related to the manufacturing, handling, or transportation of plastic pellets. Therefore, the City of Manhattan Beach is not required to monitor for plastic pellets, but will implement their spill response plan if necessary.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Storm Water Outfall Based Monitoring</b>     |   |  |
| Section 4.2, Table 8, & Figures 7 and 8         | Part VIII (page E-21 to E-23)               | Section 4.2 of the draft CIMP states that the “default Permit approach” of one site per HUC-12 per jurisdiction was chosen for the stormwater outfall-based monitoring. However, as per Section 4.2 and Table 8 of the draft CIMP, no outfall monitoring site has been selected within the Long Beach Harbor HUC-12 area (see Figure 4 and Table 8). Include justification for not including an outfall monitoring site for this HUC-12 area.  |
| Section 4.2.6                                   |   | Stormwater outfall monitoring site OF-BCEG-6, within the City of Redondo Beach, does not appear representative of either the land use distribution of the City of Redondo Beach or of the entire EWMP Group within the Lower Dominguez Channel HUC-12 area. Provide additional justification for the selection of this outfall location in the revised CIMP.   |
| Table 17  | Part VIII.B.1.c.iv (page E-23)              | Table 17 of the revised CIMP should include monitoring for SSC and monitoring for pollutants with WLAs assigned to discharges to Dominguez Channel Estuary.  |
| Section 3.0                                     | Part VII.A                                  | Section 3.0 of the draft CIMP references a GIS database that was submitted. However, the Regional Board has not received any GIS files from the Group. Please submit the referenced GIS files with the revised CIMP.   |
| <b>Non-Storm Water Outfall Based Monitoring</b> |   |  |
| Section 5.2                                     |   | Include a presentation and evaluation of observational data  |

| CIMP Reference                              | MRP Element/<br>Reference<br>(Attachment E) | Comment and Necessary Revision  |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | collected at shoreline sites under the SMB Beaches Bacteria TMDL Coordinated Shoreline Monitoring Plan when identifying outfalls with significant non-stormwater discharge. Observational sites within the Beach Cities EWMP area include O-06, O-07, and O-08, as shown in Figure 7.                   |
| Section 2.3.3 & 5.0                         | Part IX.H<br>(Page E-28)                    | Sections 2.3.3 and 5.0 of the revised CIMP should specify the dry weather conditions for non-stormwater outfall monitoring, where such monitoring is required.<br><br>Furthermore, the revised CIMP must provide justification for use of grab samples instead of composite samples during dry weather. |
| Section 5.2                                 | Part IX.C.1<br>(page E-24 to E-25)          | For the Dominguez Channel watershed, clarify in the revised CIMP that the Machado Lake subwatershed will also be included as part of the non-stormwater outfall-based screening and monitoring program.   |
| Section 5.4                                 | Part IX.E.1 & IX.E.3 (page E-26)            | Section 5.4 of the draft CIMP notes that there is no prioritized source identification at this point and that the Group will submit an outfall prioritization process to the Regional Board at a later date. The revised CIMP should include a prioritized source identification process.               |
| <b>Aquatic Toxicity</b>                     |   |   |
| Appendix D<br>Section D.1.3.2.1 & D.1.3.2.2 | Part XII.G<br>(page E-31 to E-32)           | The draft CIMP is unclear on the method for toxicity testing. The revised CIMP should clearly specify that chronic toxicity testing will be used for freshwater and saltwater species.  |

---

## Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

### Enclosure 2 – Comments on Aquatic Toxicity Testing

#### Beach Cities Watershed Management Group

We note the CIMP is proposing to follow the toxicity testing procedures as described in the MRP and in order to assess compliance with the freshwater chronic toxicity numeric target in the Dominguez Channel and Greater Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor Waters Toxics TMDL.

Part XII.I.1. (Page E-33) of the Monitoring and Reporting Program states that a toxicity test sample is immediately subject to TIE procedures if either survival or sublethal endpoints demonstrate a Percent Effect value equal to or greater than 50% at the Instream Waste Concentration. The draft CIMP does not propose to perform a TIE when at least a 50% sublethal effect is seen but instead proposes to first collect a confirmatory sample two weeks later.

This is not an acceptable approach. The CIMP seems to be implying that chronic toxicity has some inherent non-persistent quality to it that makes the results unreliable. It also implies that chronic toxicity is of lesser importance. Although it would be hard to generalize to all possible situations, the fact that a large number of invertebrates (or fish) living in a receiving water can survive an ambient pollutant concentration but are impacted in terms of growth or reproduction means that the population as a whole will be impacted, and could eventually collapse. Some species living in the receiving water have very short lifespans and during critical times of the year may be prey for other organisms that will in turn be impacted by their population decline.

**Suggested Special Study:** The 2013 study released by the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) entitled “Review of Pyrethroid, Fipronil and Toxicity Monitoring Data from California Urban Watersheds” reviewed stormwater data from studies conducted during 2005 - 2012 and highlighted the toxicity impacts from use of pesticides not currently required to be monitored for by the MRP. We suggest the group begin monitoring for these chemicals in the receiving water and, in addition, assess toxicity using the 2002 acute toxicity testing protocol (EPA-821-R-02-012) with the amphipod *Hyalella azteca* as the test organism. *H. azteca* is known to be much more sensitive to pyrethroids than is *Ceriodaphnia dubia* while the latter is useful for its sensitivity to OP pesticides. The two species together may also prove to be more useful in detecting toxicity from fipronil. And, should 50% or greater effect be detected in the toxicity test, we suggest a procedure to incorporate pyrethroids into the subsequent TIE be documented (three possible treatments have been identified by researchers, see <http://www.pubfacts.com/detail/20018342/Focused-toxicity-identification-evaluations-to-rapidly-identify-the-cause-of-toxicity-in-environment>). While fipronil does not have a TIE procedure identified currently, chemical testing for the parameter (and degradates) and comparison to U.S. EPA Office of Pesticide Program’s aquatic life benchmarks at [http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/ecorisk\\_ders/aquatic\\_life\\_benchmark.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/ecorisk_ders/aquatic_life_benchmark.htm) will aid in determining the

cause(s) of toxicity in order to follow up with outfall testing of the parameter(s) with the ultimate goal of removing the source. This approach will also help minimize inconclusive TIE results which would lead to required toxicity testing in the representative upstream outfall(s).

## Beach Cities Watershed Management Group

| Name            | City            | Email Address  |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Wisam Altowaiji | Redondo Beach   | <a href="mailto:wisam.altowaiji@redondo.org">wisam.altowaiji@redondo.org</a> |
| Andrew Brozyna  | Hermosa Beach   | <a href="mailto:abrozyna@hermosabch.org">abrozyna@hermosabch.org</a>         |
| Raul Saenz      | Manhattan Beach | <a href="mailto:rsaenz@citymb.info">rsaenz@citymb.info</a>                   |
| John C. Dettle  | Torrance        | <a href="mailto:jdettle@TorranceCA.gov">jdettle@TorranceCA.gov</a>           |
| Gary Hildebrand | LACFCD          | <a href="mailto:ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov">ghildeb@dpw.lacounty.gov</a>       |