DRAFT Comment Summary and Responses
Comment Deadline: September 30, 2015
Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to
Revise the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Trash in the Los Angeles River Watershed
and the TMDL for Trash in the Ballona Creek Watershed

List of Commenters:

| Comment Reference | Organization | Representative |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) | Gail Farber, Angela George |
| 2 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) | Sarah Abramson Sikich, Rita Kampalath, Bruce Reznik, and Becky Hayat |
| 3 | General Public | Joyce Dillard |

Response to Comments:

| No. | Author | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0.1 | Multiple | Some of the comments submitted in opposition to the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board) approval of this amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region (Basin Plan) to revise the TMDL for trash in the Los Angeles River watershed and the TMDL for trash in the Ballona Creek watershed were either previously submitted to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles Water Board) and submitted verbatim to the State Water Board without further explanation, or were not timely raised before the Los Angeles Water Board and no explanation was provided as to why the commenter was unable to raise the specific comment before the Los Angeles Water Board. | The State Water Board's Notice of Opportunity to Comment concerning this Basin Plan amendment accurately informs interested persons of the procedural requirements used to implement the State Water Board's regulatory programs. According to the State Water Board's CEQA Regulations (23 Cal. Code Regs. § 3779, subd. (f)):<br><br>The state board, when considering approval of a regional board's adoption of an amendment to its water quality control plan or guideline, shall prescribe a comment period of not less than 30 days. The |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | state board may refuse to accept any comments received after the noticed deadline. All comments submitted to the state board must be specifically related to the final amendment adopted by the regional board. If the regional board previously responded to the comment, the commenter must explain why it believes that the regional board's response was inadequate. The commenter must include either a statement that each of the comments was timely raised before the regional board, or an explanation of why the commenter was unable to raise the specific comment before the regional board. The state board may refuse to accept any comments that do not include such a statement. The state board is not required to consider any comment that is not in compliance with this section.<br><br>Several of the comments submitted to the State Water Board opposing this matter are either identical to a comment submitted to the Los Angeles Water |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Board at the time the draft version of this regulation was under consideration by the Los Angeles Water Board, or was not timely raised to the Los Angeles Water Board. Where a comment was not timely raised to the Los Angeles Water Board, the commenter did not include an explanation of why the commenter was unable to raise the specific comment before the Los Angeles Water Board. Where a commenter has merely repeated the comment submitted below or did not timely raise it to the Los Angeles Water Board, the comment does not comply with the above-quoted regulation or the State Water Board's Notice of Opportunity to Comment.<br><br>During its consideration, the Los Angeles Water Board received and provided written responses to all significant comments. Los Angeles Water Board's responses either indicated that changes would be made to the regulatory provisions or related documentation in view of the comment (in which case corresponding changes were made), or the Los Angeles Water Board's written responses indicated that changes would not be made, and the response indicated why not. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | The State Water Board cannot divine what the commenter believes has been adequately satisfied by the Los Angeles Water Board, nor can it determine the reason for any remaining dissatisfaction. Without that information, the State Water Board does not have a fair opportunity to understand what, if any, remaining concerns exist. |
| 1.1 | County of Los Angeles and LACFCD | The County of Los Angeles (County) and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) supports the proposed amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to revise the Los Angeles River and Ballona Creek Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL), herein collectively called Revised TMDLs. We believe the Revised TMDLs are sufficiently sound and should be approved as soon as possible.<br><br>The County and LACFCD have invested significant resources over the last ten years to implement trash reduction best management practices. Despite these efforts, technical infeasibilities have precluded the installation of full-capture or partial-capture trash devices in a limited number of catch basins. The Revised TMDLs include alternate compliance pathways in recognition of these challenges. In order for these alternate compliance pathways to take legal and practical effect, the Revised TMDLs must be incorporated into the Los Angeles Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit no later than the Los Angeles TMDL'S final deadline of September 2016. Therefore, the County and the LACFCD support the timely approval of the Revised TMDLs by the | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | State Water Resources Control Board. | |
| 2.1 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | Environmental Groups have advocated for the development and supported the adoption of trash TMDLs in the Los Angeles region and statewide for over a decade. We served as a member of the Public Advisory Group for the State Board Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California for trash, known as "the Trash Amendments." We were also major proponents of the original Los Angeles River Watershed and Ballona Creek trash TMDLs adopted by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board ("Regional Board") on September 19, 2001, as the provisions of the TMDL paved the way for water quality standards attainment. Of particular note, the original trash TMDL for these watersheds stood strong against many legal challenges. As final compliance deadlines approach in 2015 and 2016 for Ballona Creek and the Los Angeles River Watersheds, respectively, it is critical that responsible entities continue to make progress toward and achieve TMDL compliance.<br><br>In general, we believe the Proposed Amendments revision will assist responsible entities reach water quality standards in the future. However, we also believe some aspects of the Proposed Amendments need further refinement, as outlined in our comments below. Our comments below address the Proposed Amendments for both TMDLs. | Comment noted. See responses to specific comments below. |
| 2.2 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | **Monitoring requirements should be strengthened to enhance frequency**<br><br>The Proposed Amendments include the addition of three new monitoring requirements to track and assess trash in waterways: receiving water monitoring, plastic pellet | Comment noted. This comment was also previously made to the Los Angeles Water Board by Heal the Bay and the Los Angeles Water Board responded to it. The State Water Board reviewed and agrees with the Los |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | monitoring, and Minimum Frequency of Assessment and Collection (MFAC) Program monitoring. We support the inclusion of these requirements and believe they are necessary to accurately assess trash accumulation volumes over time. Given the lack of clear compliance demonstrations, as documented by the Regional Board in Table 1 and 2 of the Staff Report, requiring additional trash monitoring is necessary to ensure implemented trash controls are working effectively and to identify if additional management approaches are necessary to reduce trash pollution in waterways. Further, these new requirements will aid in the collection of trash data and create comparable monitoring metrics across multiple jurisdictions, which can assist the Regional Board in compliance determination and assessment of trash impairments along waterways in the long-term. | Angeles Water Board's response to Comment No. 7.8 to Los Angeles Water Board Resolution R15-006, which states:<br><br>The Regional Water Board recognizes the lack of clear compliance demonstration in Tables 1 and 2 of the Staff Report. Compliance reporting is required in the MS4 permits. The lack of clarity is due to inconsistencies in reporting under the MS4 permits. TMDL staff and MS4 staff at the Regional Water Board will be working together to revise reporting templates for the responsible agencies to ensure that the demonstration of compliance or non-compliance is clear in future reports under the MS4 permits. |
| 2.3 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | ***Heavily used areas, like open space and parks, should be more frequently monitored***<br><br>We are pleased to see that the non-point source monitoring requirements include both receiving waters and terrestrial areas. We appreciate the Regional Board's response to our comment recommending additional specificity be added the collection frequency for non-point sources; however we believe this concern was not addressed in their action on the | This comment was previously made to the Los Angeles Water Board by Heal the Bay and the Los Angeles Water Board responded to it. The State Water Board reviewed and agrees with the Los Angeles Water Board's responses to Comment Nos. 7.7, 2.2, and 2.8 to Los Angeles Water Board Resolution R15-006. During the Los Angeles Water |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Proposed Amendments, and that the monitoring frequency required is insufficient. The Proposed Amendments require trash in open space and parks managed by responsible jurisdictions and agencies to be removed completely at each assessment and collection event specified in their Trash Monitoring and Reporting Plan ("TMRP") within 72 hours after critical conditions, and immediately after special events when no safety hazards exist. In urban environments with limited open space and parks, recreational use of these areas is consistently heavy, not just limited to special events.<br><br>The Regional Board responded to our initial comment by stating that the TMPR allows for flexibility in monitoring. However, we feel this response is unsatisfactory, as there is no assurance that responsible jurisdictions will conduct additional monitoring in the way the Proposed Amendments are written. We urge the State Water Board to strengthen the nonpoint source monitoring and trash collection requirements to at least monthly for heavily used public areas, such as parks and recreational facilities, and quarterly for other open space areas. | Board adoption process, some municipal commenters requested flexibility in determining the minimum frequency of assessment and collection. In response to these comments, the Los Angeles Water Board revised the Basin Plan Amendment and Staff Report to include flexibility in trash assessment methods for receiving water monitoring. As described in the Los Angeles Water Board's response to Comment No. 2.8, which states, in part:<br><br>> In addition, responsible agencies may propose an alternate approach to compliance demonstration in their TMRP for Executive Officer approval. The TMDL does not prescribe a specific minimum frequency of assessment for each site. Assessment and collection frequency should be included in the submitted TMRP and adjusted as needed to address increased trash accumulation or critical periods. See also response to comment 2.5.<br><br>The Los Angeles Water Board determined that the minimum frequency of assessment and collection in these |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | areas could be better addressed through the MFAC/BMP Program, as setting an arbitrary one-size-fits-all collection and assessment frequency may not be warranted and nonpoint source locations may be better served by having collection and assessments locally optimized to meet their individual needs. The State Water Board agrees with this approach and notes that, while the proposed amendment provides flexibility, the initial minimum frequency in the MFAC/BMP Program requires that responsible entities demonstrate that the "trash amount accumulated between collection events…shall not show an increasing trend" and "[r]esponsible entities shall increase the frequency of collection and/or implement additional BMPs, should trash amounts collected at collection events indicate an increasing trend." Further, the TMRP is subject to Executive Officer approval, and the Executive Officer has full authority to review, to modify, to select alternative monitoring sites, and to approve or disapprove the monitoring plans. The Executive Officer may require modifications to a TMRP to address increased trash accumulation or critical periods. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.4 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | ***Receiving water monitoring sites and frequency need more specificity***<br><br>The Proposed Amendments require responsible entities to submit TMRPs outlining receiving water monitoring sites and at least two additional alternative monitoring locations. In addition, TMRPs require responsible entities to identify at least one monitoring station per reach and tributary. Although we support the inclusion of receiving water monitoring requirements in the Proposed Amendments, we believe sampling one site per reach and tributary will not accurately assess trash accumulation in receiving waters. Trash accumulation rates can vary considerably across reaches and tributaries because of differences in channel construction; trapezoidal channels differ from box channels, soft bottom differ from hard bottom, etc. Because of these differences, we request that the Proposed Amendments be modified to include language that requires responsible entities to monitor more than one monitoring site in reaches and tributaries that have variable channel configurations. For example, reaches and tributaries that have trapezoidal channels consisting of both hard and soft bottom should at least have two different receiving water monitoring sites, as trash accumulates in greater amounts in waterways with soft bottoms that support vegetation.<br><br>We raised this concern to the Regional Board, which was met by the response that they will focus on best management practices ("BMPs") for compliance. We believe that our recommendation should be reconsidered by the State Board, as the Proposed Amendments also allow for compliance determined through a combination of full capture devices, institutional controls, and partial capture devices. For both | This comment was previously made to the Los Angeles Water Board by Heal the Bay and the Los Angeles Water Board responded to it. The State Water Board reviewed and agrees with the Los Angeles Water Board's response to Comment No. 7.9 to Los Angeles Water Board Resolution R15-006, which states, in part:<br><br>> The Regional Water Board aims to require the collection of useful receiving water data, while keeping the focus of responsible agencies on the implementation of programs and BMPs that control or reduce trash discharges. One monitoring station per segment will be sufficient for periodic comparisons and trend analysis, while a greater number of stations sampled during differing conditions may be more appropriate in a special study.<br><br>Further, monitoring design and frequency may be adjusted based on need or if informed by special studies. See response to Comment No. 2.4. above. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | instructional controls and partial capture devices, monitoring is essential to gauge their effectiveness at advancing a zero trash goal. Therefore, it is imperative that monitoring requirements thoroughly capture the potential differences in trash within receiving waters with variable substrate. | |
| 2.5 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | **New alternative compliance methods for full and partial capture devices should be approached with caution**<br><br>The Proposed Amendments include three new alternative compliance approaches for full capture and partial capture devices. The numeric target for trash in both the Los Angeles River Watershed and Ballona Creek Watershed Trash TMDLs is zero. Both TMDLs were developed with the notion that final compliance would be attained when zero trash is discharged into waterways. Environmental Groups understand the complexity of managing the region's trash problem, and we are aware of the challenges presented with implementation of each trash TMDL. We commend the efforts responsible parties have put forth up to this point to comply with the Los Angeles River Watershed and Ballona Creek Watershed Trash TMDLs. It is necessary that the elements within TMDLs (both the zero trash requirement and compliance metrics) remain strong to effectively curb our region's trash problems.<br><br>Los Angeles is one of the most heavily developed and populated counties in the nation. Trash pollution is chronic and the Regional Board rightfully adopted Trash TMDLs for Los Angeles River and Ballona Creek in 2001 and 2007. Both TMDLs are approaching their final compliance deadlines. Adding alternative compliance determination methodology at the end of TMDL implementation schedules is a slippery slope. If this approach is used regularly, it has the potential to | See response to Comment No. 0.1. This comment was previously made to the Los Angeles Water Board and the Los Angeles Water Board responded to it. The commenter has not explained why and in what manner the commenter believes the Los Angeles Water Board's response to this comment was inadequate or incorrect.<br><br>The State Water Board agrees that new alternative compliance methods should be approached with caution. The State Water Board, however, believes that the Los Angeles Water Board did proceed cautiously in this matter by retaining the zero target for trash, relying on compliance methods with demonstrated capabilities and requiring additional monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of the compliance methods.<br><br>The State Water Board reviewed and agrees with the Los Angeles Water Board's response to Comment No. 7.11 to Los Angeles Water Board Resolution R15-006, which states: |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | seriously undermine already adopted TMDLs. Further, the precedent setting nature of changing final compliance metrics for TMDLs that have been implemented for almost a decade is concerning, especially when new alternative compliance methods may be less stringent than what was proposed in the original TMDLs. Because of this, we urge the State Board to approach the new alternative compliance methods for full and partial capture devices with caution. | The Regional Water Board appreciates the commenter's concern and agrees that careful consideration of changes to compliance determinations towards the end of TMDL implementation schedules should be given. Given the complexity of TMDLs and implementation timeframes, the Regional Water Board, responsible entities and stakeholders continue to gain knowledge and experience during the TMDL implementation period. The Regional Water Board strives to adopt and implement effective TMDLs that achieve the objective of attaining water quality standards and restoring beneficial uses, as efficiently as possible. To achieve effectiveness and efficiency, the Regional Water Board provides flexibility regarding implementation where appropriate and consistent with the objective of the TMDL.<br><br>Based on these factors, and after careful consideration, the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Regional Water Board has determined that new alternative compliance approaches for full and partial capture devices are warranted, while still maintaining a numeric target of zero trash.<br><br>The Regional Water Board does note that the alternative compliance metrics are not "less stringent" than what was in the original TMDL; the target for trash is still zero, but greater detail has been added on ways to show compliance with the target. This is consistent with the original TMDLs. |
| 2.6 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | The original Ballona Creek Watershed and Los Angeles River Watershed Trash TMDLs included a technological based compliance option for responsible entities. Municipalities that chose to retrofit all catch basins with full capture devices, following TMDL implementation schedules, were deemed to be in compliance with the TMDL. Pursuing this approach is resource intensive, encountering not only financial, but also engineering constraints. Yet, many cities have already achieve compliance. As identified in the staff report and Proposed Amendments, in some cases it was technically infeasible to install full capture devices at some catch basins because of physical constraints associated with channel configuration. | See response to Comment No. 0.1. This comment was previously made to the Los Angeles Water Board and the Los Angeles Water Board responded to it. The commenter has not explained why and in what manner the commenter believes the Los Angeles Water Board's response to this comment was inadequate or incorrect.<br><br>The State Water Board reviewed and agrees with the Los Angeles Water Board's response to Comment No. 7.14 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | To address trash in areas that are not managed by full capture systems because of technical infeasibility, the Regional Board proposes alternative compliance criteria (below) in the Proposed Amendments.<br><br>1) 98% of all catch basins within the agency's jurisdictional land area in the watershed are retrofitted with FCS (or, alternatively, 98% of the jurisdiction's drainage area is addressed by FCS) and at least 97% of the catch basins (or, alternatively, drainage area) within the agency's jurisdiction in the subwatershed (the smaller of the HUC-12 equivalent area or tributary subwatershed) are retrofitted with FCS.<br><br>2) The agency submits to the Regional Board a report for Executive Officer concurrence, detailing the technical infeasibility of FCS retrofits in the remaining catch basins and evaluating the feasibility of partial capture devices, and the potential to install FCS or partial capture devices along the storm drain or at the MS4 outfall downgradient from the catch basin.<br><br>3) The agency submits to the Regional Board a report for Executive Officer approval, detailing the partial capture devices and/or institutional controls that are currently and will continue to be implemented in the affected subwatershed(s), including an assessment of the effectiveness of the partial capture devices and/or institutional controls using existing data and studies representative of the subwatershed or | to Los Angeles Water Board Resolution R15-006, which states:<br><br>The Regional Water Board disagrees. The Staff Report considered three methods for determining that a responsible agency had effectively achieved 100% compliance given the inherent variability of the Daily Generation Rate (DGR) estimation and, subsequently, the calculation of annual trash discharged. These included 1) *Within the Effectiveness of a Structural Vortex Separation Systems*, 2) *Within Demonstrated Full Capture System Effectiveness* and 3) *Practical Calculation Limit of Partial Capture Devices and Institutional Controls*. The Basin Plan Amendments incorporate the most conservative of these three alternatives. It is important to address the inherent variability of the DGR estimation at this time as the final deadline for compliance with the TMDL is approaching because it is used to calculate the annual trash discharged. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | jurisdictional area. If, based on Regional Board evaluation, existing data and studies are determined non-representative, responsible jurisdictions may also be required to conduct a special study of institutional controls and partial capture devices in the particular subwatershed(s) where the non-retrofitted catch basins are located.[2]<br><br>We appreciate the Regional Board's carefulness of working to uphold the zero trash requirement of these TMDLs and its prioritization of full capture devices, yet, we have concerns about allowing responsible entities to use partial capture for TMDL compliance. The intention of the partial capture approach is to reach baseline loading reductions identified in the original TMDLs by a specific date. Therefore, meeting baseline load reductions is critical for compliance. Responsible entities should not be given the opportunity to request that 97% or 98% of baseline load reduction constitute full compliance with final waste load allocations. Between 99%-100% reduction in baseline trash loading should be the only criteria for TMDL compliance. Given the fact that responsible entities that pursued a partial capture compliance approach were not required to retrofit all catch basins in jurisdictional boundaries, and that opportunities still exist to install partial or full catch devices at non-retrofitted catch basins, we believe that more can be through BMPs to meet baseline load reductions. | |
| 2.7 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | Further, we are concerned that the Proposed Amendments alter final water quality based compliance approaches 1-2 years prior to final compliance deadlines. Additionally, the Trash Policy adopted by the State Water Resources Control | See response to Comment No. 0.1. This comment was previously made to the Los Angeles Water Board and the Los Angeles Water Board responded to |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Board in April 2015 requires that Track 2 (which allows for a combination of BMPs and treatment controls to meet full capture system equivalency) specifically demonstrate equivalency with full capture systems. Allowing for responsible parties to decrease their trash load reduction requirements to demonstrate compliance is in direct contravention with the Track 2 approach, as it does not represent equivalency, but instead represents trash capture that is less-than Track 1 equivalent. It is important that any amendments to these TMDLs are consistent with the statewide Trash Policy. Moreover, altering final compliance criteria for a sunsetting TMDL sets a disturbing precedent. Will this be an approach used for other TMDLs, such as bacteria or metals when responsible agencies cannot attain final waste load allocations? Our preference is that the alternative compliance approach for partial capture devices be removed from the Proposed Amendment. | it. The commenter has not explained why and in what manner the commenter believes the Los Angeles Water Board's response to this comment was inadequate or incorrect.<br><br>The State Water Board reviewed and agrees with the Los Angeles Water Board's response to Comment No. 7.15 to Los Angeles Water Board Resolution R15-006, which states:<br><br>Responsible agencies are not allowed to "decrease their trash load reduction requirements", as targets and wasteload allocations remain the same. While the "full capture equivalency" is a method for deriving allocations the Regional Water Board considered an approach based on a full capture device efficiency described in the Staff Report and response to comment 1.14 above, *Within the Effectiveness of a Structural Vortex Separation System*, but ultimately incorporated a more conservative approach to final compliance demonstration where responsible agencies |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | are utilizing a combination of partial capture devices and institutional controls.<br><br>The Regional Water Board does not believe these revisions represent a "slippery slope," but are reasonable compliance details to address the issue of variability in DGR estimation and extrapolation to determine annual trash discharged.<br><br>Also the TMDL is not "sunsetting," but remains a vital regulation that will continue to be implemented after the final implementation guideline. Note the language in the Los Angeles County MS4 Permit, Attachment O, Part A.3, footnote 3, which states "Permittees shall achieve their final effluent limitation of zero trash discharge for the 2015-16 storm year *and every year thereafter*" and the equivalent footnote in Attachment M, Part E.1.c.<br><br>Note that the Statewide Trash Amendments adopted in April |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 2015 do not apply to the trash TMDLs for Los Angeles River or Ballona Creek watersheds. The Statewide Trash Amendments specifically state that "these Trash Provisions apply to all surface waters of the State, with the exception of those waters with the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles Water Board) for which trash Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) are in effect prior to the effective date of these Trash Provisions" (see Appendix E, Part 1 Trash Provisions, Chapter IV.A.1.b). |
| 2.8 | Heal the Bay, Los Angeles Waterkeeper, and the NRDC | We greatly appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important matter. Trash pollution is a critical issue for the Los Angeles Region, and threatens several beneficial uses in both the Ballona Creek and Los Angeles River Watersheds. We urge the State Board to make the aforementioned adjustments to the Proposed Amendment to ensure that it is consistent with the Trash Policy and is effective in meeting the zero trash requirement of the Ballona Creek and Los Angeles River Watershed TMDLs. | Comment noted. |
| 3.1 | Joyce Dillard | California Water Code (CWC) Section 13241 Economic Considerations appear to be defined in savings reduction, but | See response to Comment No. 0.1. This comment pertaining to economic considerations of California Water Code |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | what is the cost? | section 13241 was not timely raised before the Los Angeles Water Board nor was an explanation of why the commenter was unable to raise the specific comment provided.<br><br>As noted by the Los Angeles Water Board in Finding 23 of Resolution R15-006, "Neither TMDLs nor their targets or other components are water quality objectives, and thus their establishment or revision does not implicate California Water Code section 13241." Therefore, the Los Angeles Water Board was not required to consider the factors in California Water Code section 13241.<br><br>The commenter did submit a written comment to the Los Angeles Water Board concerning sources of funding to implement the tasks in the revised TMDL. The Los Angeles Water Board noted in its response to Comment No. 8.10 to Resolution R15-006:<br><br>In these TMDL reconsiderations, the Regional Water Board is not required to identify sources of funding to implement TMDL tasks. However, the Regional Water Board notes that a reasonable range of economic factors in |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | estimating potential costs was considered in the adoption of the original TMDLs. That analysis along with the substitute environmental documents, response to comments, Basin Plan amendment and supporting documents, were completed in fulfillment of the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21159).<br><br>Further, because this TMDL implements existing water quality objectives, it does not "establish" water quality objectives and no analysis of the factors identified in Water Code section 13241 is required.<br><br>Further, implementation of the revised TMDLs are not expected to require additional management or control for stormwater management agencies beyond what is currently required, but would, in fact, provide added flexibility for implementing agencies. Additional monitoring requirements, in addition to currently required monitoring under |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | stormwater and MS4 permits, was detailed by the Los Angeles Water Board in Sections 2.3.5, 2.4.5, and 2.5.1 in the Los Angeles Water Board's Staff Report, and may be sufficiently offset based on costs derived from the implementation flexibility included in the revised TMDLs. |
| 3.2 | Joyce Dillard | California Water Code (CWC) Section 13241 Need to Develop Housing within the Region has not addressed costs to the homeowner. | See response to Comment No. 0.1. This comment was not timely raised before the Los Angeles Water Board nor was an explanation of why the commenter was unable to raise the specific comment provided.<br><br>See response to Comment 3.1 above.<br><br>As noted above, implementation of the revised TMDLs are not expected to require additional management or control for stormwater management agencies beyond what is currently required nor adversely impact housing, but would, in fact, provide added flexibility for implementing agencies. |