

# **EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

## June 2012

### NORTH BASIN

1. Update on Statewide Permitting Activity for Phase II MS4s, Caltrans, Industrial Stormwater and Construction Stormwater Dischargers – Alan Miller

The State Water Board is currently in the process of reissuing several statewide general National Pollution Elimination System (NPDES) permits that compose the backbone of the state's stormwater programs. Phase I communities (population > 100,000) and Lake Tahoe municipalities are currently covered under individual permits, with the exception of Caltrans at Lake Tahoe. These permits are to be reissued at five-year intervals and are overdue. They may be considered controversial for a number of reasons, including increased costs of compliance. The Regional Water Boards have been involved in the development of the general permits, providing comments and other input to the State Water Board staff. State Board is holding public workshops around the State to inform and gather input for planned adoptions later this calendar year. Additional information can be obtained at the State Water Board's website for Stormwater Permits, and is summarized below.

<u>MS4-Phase II</u>: The statewide permit for municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4) covered under USEPA's Phase II regulatory rule for stormwater has been issued in a draft form and has been revised significantly following a previous public release. This general permit currently affects the MS4s for municipalities draining to the Mojave and Truckee rivers in the Lahontan region. With this permit reissuance, MS4 Phase II Dischargers will be expected to utilize for the first time the Stormwater Multi-Application Tracking System (SMARTs) online database for MS4 permit interactions. Written comments are due no later than noon on Monday, July 23, 2012.

Caltrans MS4: The statewide permit for Caltrans stormwater has been issued in a draft form and has been revised significantly following a previous public release. Caltrans significantly opposed the prior draft permit of August 18, 2011, resulting in testimony before members of the California Legislature by the State Water Board Executive Director. Notably, significantly reduced monitoring is now required in the draft permit. Other planned significant changes with this permit will be the removal of construction activity, which will be regulated in the future under the statewide General Construction Permit, and the requirement to meet established Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) in various watersheds. The permit defers TMDL implementation

for two years, with the exception of the Lake Tahoe TMDL. Written comments are due no later than June 26, 2012. In addition to the permit, we recently issued to Caltrans District 3 an Order for technical reports and receiving water monitoring in the Truckee River watershed. Caltrans has petitioned the Order to the State Board, but has requested petition be held in abeyance while differences are worked out with Regional Board staff. I granted an extension until October 1, 2012, for Caltrans to submit a monitoring plan while discussions continue.

Industrial General Permit: The statewide permit for ten specific categories of industry that discharge stormwater to waters of the U.S. is called the Industrial General Permit or IGP. The Lahontan Water Board has several hundred facilities enrolled under the existing permit. A significant proposed addition for the renewed permit include requirements to have properly qualified and trained staff to develop and implement pollution control plans to protect stormwater quality at the industrial facilities. A draft IGP was released for public comment.

**Construction General Permit: The** statewide Construction General Permit (CGP) was adopted in 2009, and became effective in 2010. That permit included, among other things, two requirements that the Building Industry Association (BIA) sued the State Water Board for including: 1) a cap on turbidity for highrisk sites, 500 NTU (turbidity units), and 2) requirements for each construction site to include and implement "postconstruction" stormwater treatment and runoff controls. The Court said the State Board could (1) include a cap on turbidity, but improperly computed the 500 NTU effluent limit, and (2) require systems to control runoff after the construction

activity is complete. As a result, every construction project in the state under the CGP must include "post-construction" runoff controls as specified in the CGP. The CGP is being reopened to address the remand on the effluent limit. The State Board proposes to remove effluent limit at this time. United States Environmental Protection Agency is in the process of revising the applicable rules for effluent limits nationwide and only a limited number of facilities are affected in California, so the loss on this matter is not considered significant. Comments on the amendments were due on May 14, 2012.

#### 2. Funding Update: Asian Clam Control Projects – Dan Sussman

Staff requests for Cleanup and Abatement Account (CAA) funding, in conjunction with Lahontan Board Resolution R6T-2010-0014, has secured \$788,720 for Asian clam control at Lake Tahoe since 2009. Through this and other funding, the Asian clam program has investigated means of suffocating clams under bottom barriers, surveyed Lake Tahoe for the extent of Asian clam infestations, and tackled the unique challenges posed by the Asian clam infestation in the mouth of Emerald Bay. The high cost of these projects reflects their novelty, investigative nature, and the difficulty of performing field work while SCUBA diving in cold waters.

As of May 18, 2012, \$332,658 of the CAA funding has been spent or is in contract for the following projects:

 \$100,000 – partial funding for original Asian clam control pilot investigation using 10'x10' barriers at Lakeside Marina

#### Executive Officer's Report April 16, 2012 – May 15, 2012

- \$99,879 full funding of a lakewide survey of Asian clam investigation
- \$37,557 full funding for a 2011 SCUBA survey of Emerald Bay infestation to pinpoint extent of infestation and determine spread since 2010 survey
- \$95,222 investigation of alternate methods of lowering oxvgen concentrations under the bottom barriers in Emerald Bay, and investigating success of long term placement of barriers (~9 months). The dynamics of Lake-Bay interaction were shown to prevent barrier success, as oxygen reduction was not consistent with previous investigations. This project investigated supplementing bottom barriers with organic matter to aid in oxygen reduction. Field work for this project is complete as of the writing of this report, but data has not yet been fully analyzed. Preliminary results indicate success with the supplemented barrier method.

The remaining \$456,062 is scheduled to address the remaining Asian clam infestation in Emerald Bay in a project termed the "Emerald Bay Big Lay." The current infestation covers ~5 acres of the lake bottom near the mouth of the bay. The project design will be informed by the lessons learned from previous projects. The goal of the project is to rid the bay of Asian clams. The project will actually cost in the neighborhood of \$750,000 when monitoring and experimental costs are included. The balance is scheduled to be funded by a Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act science grant that was written and proposed in coordination with the Asian Clam Working Group. The Emerald Bay Big Lay is scheduled to begin this fall.

#### 3. Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy -Tom Gavigan

On May 1, 2012, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) unanimously adopted a Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (Policy). The Policy recognizes that resources available for environmental restoration are limited and the highest priority for the limited resources is the protection of human health and environmental receptors. The Policy is supported by the welldocumented fact that petroleum fuels naturally attenuate in the environment through adsorption, dispersion, volatilization, and biological degradation. The purpose of the Policy is to establish consistent statewide closure criteria for low threat petroleum UST sites.

The Policy identifies eight <u>general criteria</u> that must be satisfied for a site to meet the Policy:

- 1. The unauthorized release is within the service area of a public water system.
- 2. The unauthorized release consists only of petroleum.
- 3. The primary release from the UST system has been stopped.
- 4. Free product has been removed to the maximum extent practicable.
- 5. Secondary source has been removed to the extent practicable.
- 6. A conceptual model that assesses the nature, extent, and mobility of the release has been developed.
- 7. Soil or groundwater has been tested for MTBE and results

reported in accordance with Health and Safety Code section 25296.15.

 Nuisance as defined by Water Code section 13050 does not exist at the site.

The Policy provides more detailed descriptions for each of these criteria.

Because releases from USTs can impact human health and the environment through contact with contaminated media, the Policy also identifies <u>three media-</u> <u>specific criteria</u> that must be satisfied for a site to meet the Policy:

- <u>Groundwater</u>: The policy requires groundwater plumes affected by the release must be stable or decreasing in areal extent. Additional criteria are based on the groundwater plume concentrations, the size of the plume, and the nearest surface water body and supply well.
- 2. <u>Vapor intrusion to indoor air</u>: The Policy describes conditions including bioattenuation zones, which if met will assure that exposure to petroleum vapors in indoor air will not pose unacceptable health risks.
- 3. <u>Direct contact and outdoor air</u> <u>exposure:</u> The Policy describes conditions where direct contact with contaminated soil or inhalation of contaminants in outdoor air poses a low threat to human health.

The Policy also includes notification of stakeholders and an associated 60-day comment period, and monitoring well destruction and waste removal requirements. In the Resolution adopting the Policy, the State Board directs the Regional Water Boards and local agencies to review all cases in the petroleum UST Cleanup Program using the Policy's framework within one year.

#### 4. State Board Approves Lahontan Water Board's Pesticide Prohibition Basin Plan Amendment – Mary Fiore-Wagner

On May 15, 2012, the State Board approved the Lahontan Water Board's recommendation to amend its Basin Plan and replace an unworkable Pesticide Water Quality Objective with a Pesticide Waste Discharge Prohibition with exemption criteria to allow appropriate uses of aquatic pesticides.

During the State Board hearing, Board member Dudoc requested changes to some of Lahontan Water Board staff's responses provided to comments by the California Association of Sanitation Agenices and Tri-TAC Associations, a jointly sponsored association of the League of California Cities, CASA, and the California Water Environment Association. CASA and Tri-TAC's comments expressed concern that discharges from POTWs (publicly owned treatment works) may violate the pesticide prohibition on occasions if trace amounts of pesticides are discharged in effluent and found in ground or surface waters. As such, CASA and Tri-TAC requested that the amendment be revised to include a blanket exemption for trace amounts of pesticides discharged in a POTW's effluent and in waters. Water Board's responses addressing these concerns have been revised to indicate that the Water Board will consider the potential discharge of pesticides in POTW's effluent when permits for these POTWs are reissued.

Now that the State Water Board has approved the Pesticide Prohibition Amendment, Staff must next submit it for approval by the Office of Administrative Law and then the United States Environmental Protection Agency before the amendment takes effect in the Lahontan Region. Staff anticipates these additional approvals by the end of this summer.

#### 5. Projects Being Planned to Improve Safety at Dams on the Lower Truckee River

- Alan Miller

Staff has been working with two federal agencies to address dam safety issues at several dams on the Truckee River system. There are two dams currently undergoing Congressionally-mandated safety reviews because they do not meet the agency's criteria to prevent dam failures. These are the Stampede Dam on the Little Truckee River owned and operated by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and the Martis Creek Dam owned and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Both these dams were built to impound waters tributary to the Truckee River. The Water Board must review and permit consistent with Clean Water Act (CWA) section 401 requirements for dredged and fill material the California Environmental Quality Act, CWA section 402 storm water control requirements and the Basin Plan.

For the Stampede Dam the Bureau is in the process of completing a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. The Water Board is the Lead Agency for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) certification. The Water Board has received an incomplete application for section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Bureau and staff is in the process of identifying all potentially significant issues that may affect the environment from the proposed project.

For the Martis Creek Dam, staff has been commenting on and facilitating studies of the dam by the Corps, who is analyzing the various alternatives for what to do about this ongoing very dangerous situation. No specific proposal or application for certification has been received by the Water Board from the Corps. The Water Board previously authorized work to support the investigative studies. Staff anticipates a permit application this calendar year.

#### 6. Status of USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit South Shore Project 2012 Annual Operating Plans – Douglas Cushman

The Water Board adopted Waste Discharge Requirements for the US Forest Service. Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit's South Shore Fuels **Reduction and Healthy Forest** Restoration Project at its meeting on April 11, 2012. A provision of the WDR is that annual operating plans that cover proposed activities for each implementation season be submitted to the Water Board office for review and acceptance. The WDR states that staff will review the annual operations plans within 30 days of submission. Staff contacted the LTBMU on April 12, 2012 to request the 2012 operations plan. To date, the proposed plan has not been submitted and staff are eager to review the operating plan to expedite commencement of this important project.

#### 7. Modeling Report: Lake Tahoe Fuels Reduction Strategy - Robert Larsen

Resource management agencies developed the Lake Tahoe Basin Multi-Jurisdictional Fuel Reduction and Wildfire Prevention Strategy (Fuel Reduction Strategy) to prevent potential future damage from extreme forest fires.

The Fuel Reduction Strategy proposes to reduce forest fuel loads on close to 70,000 acres across multiple jurisdictions, including lands managed by the United States Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU). While actions associated with fuel reduction work serve as preventative maintenance against a catastrophic forest fire, they also represent new watershed disturbances that could influence sediment delivery to Lake Tahoe and its tributaries.

With federal funding for the statewide TMDL program, the Lahontan Water Board contracted with Tetra Tech, Inc. to evaluate the potential impact of the Fuel Reduction Strategy on sediment loading to Lake Tahoe. The analysis relied on geographic information system data to locate planned treatments and new forest roads and used both site-specific and basin-wide modeling techniques to estimate the potential impact of widespread application of mechanical vegetation management techniques.

At the Water Board's April 2012 meeting, Doug Smith presented the initial findings of the analysis to support the Board's assessment of the South Shore Fuel Reduction and Healthy Forest Restoration Project. Tetra Tech's initial findings, as reported by Mr. Smith in April, suggested that proposed fuels management work could increase fine sediment particle loading from forested lands by as much as twelve percent above the TMDL baseline load. Upon further review and refinement, the revised maximum potential fine sediment particle load increase (under current likely scenarios) is now reported at just over three percent.

It is important to note that the Tetra Tech estimates of potential sediment load increases represent a worst-case scenario. The analysis assumes that all areas are treated simultaneously, and while basic best management practices are included, the assessment was unable to account for advanced best management practices and additional mitigation measures.

The analysis of the potential impacts of the Fuel Reduction Strategy highlights the importance of use of low impact methods such as hand crews, phasing efforts and staging projects across different sub-watersheds and post project mitigation measures (including seeding, mulching, and road decommissioning) to ensure that fine sediment particle loading is not increased. Fuel reduction projects. such as the South Shore Fuels Reduction project, will be required to implement appropriate mitigation measures to prevent potential increases in pollutant loading to Lake Tahoe. Additional monitoring and a strong Water Board field presence will further help guide the implementation of future fuels management projects to protect water quality.

#### 8. Water Board Participation in 2012 Snapshot Day – Bruce Warden

Snapshot Day is an annual water quality monitoring event covering the Lake Tahoe and Truckee River watersheds. Water Board staff have been participating in Lake Tahoe area Snapshot Day since its inception twelve years ago. Water Board Staff Environmental Scientist Cindy Rofer-Wise participated in a new Snapshot Day event on May 11 for elementary school students taking four elementary school 5th grade classes in South Lake on a field trip to a local stream. All of the students participated in stations teaching water quality, the importance of trees, macro-invertebrates, and riparian corridor assessment. On May 12, SWAMP staff Lisa Petrusa and Lahontan student intern Raina Patrocino conducted in-house analysis of turbidity. fecal coliform and E. coli. South Shore area volunteers were split into groups with trained team leaders and spent the morning collecting samples while learning about water quality, the ecology of the Sierra, and the importance of our unique watershed. Bruce Warden volunteered as a team leader. Volunteers sampled over 30 locations on streams from Zephyr Cove to Meeks Bay. This year was the largest Snapshot Day to date with over 100 volunteers participating.

Water Board staff use this opportunity to fulfill the Regional Water Board goal of public outreach involving cooperation with other agencies, dissemination of water quality information, specific water quality sampling training in the local community, and development of water quality stewardship. Information from Snapshot Day is used to assess status of the Lake Tahoe watershed and identify problem areas. In some cases, follow-up investigation of problem areas has resulted in Water Board enforcement and corrective actions.

#### SOUTH BASIN

#### 9. Emergency, Abandoned, and Recalcitrant (EAR) Account Nominations- Brian Grey

Chapter 6.75 of the Health and Safety Code authorizes the State Water Board to provide funding to regional water boards. local agencies, and local oversight agencies to initiate direct cleanup of petroleum UST sites requiring corrective action to protect human health, safety, and the environment. The State Water Board receives annual nominations from the regional boards that have sites within their region that meet the EAR Account criteria. Since funding from the EAR Account is limited, the State Water Board allocates monies to the various projects depending on the number of nominations received, threat to human health and the environment, and funding availability.

For the fiscal year 2012-2013, two sites in the Lahontan Region were re-nominated for inclusion on the EAR Account Annual Site List. The Lahontan Water Board renominated the Yermo Truck Stop located in Yermo and Nevada County Environmental Health Department renominated the Pat and Ollies Superstop located in Truckee. The Executive Officer recommended these nominations to the State Water Board.

The Yermo Truck Stop has been nominated to the EAR Account Annual Site List for many years, but did not receive funding until fiscal year 2011-12. This year, funds were authorized to remove several underground storage tanks (USTs) at the abandoned site. The UST removals were completed in February 2012, as reported in the March 2012 EO Report, and were necessary to remove a potential source of contamination that had previously affected a municipal supply well in the area. Additional delineation of the remaining soil contamination, investigation of the groundwater, and comparison to the recently adopted Water Quality Control Policy for Low Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure will be necessary prior to the issuance of a No Further Action Required Letter. Staff anticipates that these investigative activities will be conducted during the upcoming fiscal year using funds from the EAR account.

The former Pat and Ollies Superstop currently operates a groundwater extraction remediation system to provide hydraulic control of the residual petroleum hydrocarbon groundwater plume. EAR account funds in fiscal year 2012-13 would fund continued operation and maintenance of the existing remediation system and groundwater monitoring activities.

#### 10. Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and Salt/Nutrient Management Plan Meetings – Jan M. Zimmerman

Beginning in May 2006, member agencies of the Antelope Valley Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) have met and developed an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). The purpose of the IRWMP is to develop a watershed-based approach for addressing water supply, water quality, flood control, land use, and environmental resource management as related to the Antelope Valley. Water Board staff attended a meeting of the Antelope Valley RWMG on April 18, 2012. The purpose of this meeting was to present a proposed outline of the IRWMP update and to establish working groups. Four new components are planned for the update including outreach to disadvantaged communities such as Lake Los Angeles, Ridgecrest, Mojave, Little Rock, and the unincorporated areas of Palmdale and Lancaster: salt and nutrient management planning; integrated flood management; and climate change. A scope of work and an application for Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E granting funding will be submitted during fall 2012. Water Board staff agreed to participate in the Integrated Flood Management working group.

In addition, Antelope Valley East Kern (AVEK) Water Agency, provided an update to the Water Supply Stabilization Project No. 2 Recharge and Recovery Project. Approximately 16,000 acre-feet of State Water Project water has been recharged, to date, and AVEK is prepared to install six new recovery wells. City of Palmdale provided an update on the Upper Amargosa Creek Recharge Project. The project is designed with integrated flood control and recharge components and will provide for up to 6,400 acre-feet of stormwater recharge on an annual basis. Additionally the City is retrofitting the 20-acre McAdam Park for recycled water irrigation use. The park will utilize up to 60 acre-feet of recycled water annually and will be the first cityowned park to use recycled water.

#### 11. Barstow Perchlorate Site Investigation and Public Meeting – *Tim Post*

The Regional Water Board's Site Investigation Report concerning perchlorate-contaminated groundwater in the vicinity of Poplar Street in Barstow

was released to the public on April 5, 2012. The Report describes the results of groundwater sampling performed by the Water Board's contractor URS, Inc. Drilling and sampling activities were conducted from December 9 through December 21, 2011.Groundwater samples were collected at 22 locations of the uppermost groundwater (top of the water table) to define the lateral extent of contamination. Depths to groundwater ranged from 16 to 25 feet below ground surface. Results of the sampling indicate the majority of perchlorate-contaminated groundwater extends from its source at the residential property located at 30433 Poplar Street approximately 3,500 feet in a southeasterly direction toward the Soap Mine Road production well. The highest concentration detected (13,000 parts per billion) in groundwater was from a sample collected approximately 750 feet southeast of the source area.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) performed extensive soil sampling at 30433 Poplar in March and August 2011 and again in April 2012. Based on the results of these sampling events, and to eliminate the source of perchlorate contamination, USEPA is planning to remove and/or treat the contaminated soil at the site sometime late in 2012.

During its August 2011 field sampling, USEPA also sampled the Pyrotechnics Corporation factory site located at 36131 North Yucca Street. No significant perchlorate contamination was found in soil at the former pyrotechnics manufacturing facility.

A public information meeting was held in Barstow the evening of April 24, 2012. Staff from both the Water Board and USEPA gave presentations to the public on the results of their respective investigations and answered numerous questions. A fact sheet describing the Site Investigation results, was distributed at the meeting. Electronic copies of USEPA's and the Water Board's Site Investigation reports have been distributed to interested parties. These reports and fact sheets about the site are posted on Water Board's website at: <u>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/</u> <u>water\_issues/programs/perchlorlate/index\_.shtml.</u>

#### 12. Development of Lake Maintenance Plan for Lake Arrowhead, Arrowhead Lake Association – Jan Zimmerman

Lake Arrowhead, a man-made lake, is a drinking water source and recreational attraction for the San Bernardino Mountain community. Over the last several decades, there has been considerable development in this area that has contributed to increased runoff volumes and increased sediment loads not only to Lake Arrowhead, but to the entire system of mountain streams and lakes. Residents and visitors alike are noticing changes in the quality of the water of the area's surface water resources.

Due to the increased sediment loads carried by the tributary streams entering Lake Arrowhead, Arrowhead Lake Association (ALA) is realizing a marked reduction in the capacity of the lake and the clarity of the water. In addition, damage to existing dock structures and shallowing of bays around the perimeter of the lake is limiting private land owner accessibility. As a result, ALA is in the process of developing a Lake Maintenance Plan that will outline the activities necessary to maintain the drinking water and recreational uses of the lake. On April 23, 2012, Water Board staff met with representatives of ALA to

discuss the plan and the immediate and long-term maintenance needs. ALA proposes, initially, to dredge the bays of the lake to an established baseline condition tied to when the lake was first formed in the late 1800's. Several sediment debris basins currently exist around the lake and act to retain some of the sediment within the tributary drainages. Water Board staff recommended that, for long-term maintenance. ALA should focus on frequent and regular maintenance of these basins to control sediment loads prior to discharge into the lake. Over time, this will improve clarity, reduce the volume of material needed to be dredged. and reduce the frequency at which dredging would occur. Water Board staff support the development of this plan and encourage ALA to seek cooperation from the California Department of Fish and Game, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and residents of the Lake Arrowhead community.

#### 13. Water Quality Highlighted at Career Day – Brianna Bergen

Brianna Bergen, an Engineering Geologist from our Victorville office, served as a guest lecturer during a Career Day event hosted by Heritage School in Phelan on May 10, 2012. Ms. Bergen spoke to approximately 90 eighth grade students, as well as 3 teachers. The discussion stressed the importance of clean water and water quality, highlighted the role that Water Board staff have in keeping our water clean, and included measures and suggestions that all of us may take to help keep water clean and continue to improve water quality. Ms. Bergen also reviewed some of the problems that we encounter if our water is not kept clean. Ms. Bergen demonstrated various tools and equipment that we use in the course of our jobs, and also displayed some

spectacular mineral samples that she has collected from the region. Immediate positive feedback was received from teachers and students alike, indicating that they now have a better understanding of water quality and what it means to work for a Regional Water Quality Control Board.

#### 14. County Sanitation District No. 20 of Los Angeles County (District), Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant, Los Angeles County – *Mike Coony*

The District completed construction of the Tertiary Treatment Facility Project at the Palmdale Water Reclamation Plant. The new facility became operational on December 15, 2011 and produces title 22 tertiary effluent.

#### **Cleanup and Abatement Order**

The District is under Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) No. R6V-2003-056 to address nitrate pollution in groundwater. The CAO requires the District to delineate groundwater nitrate contamination, develop a remediation plan, implement a remedial action plan, and reduce the amount of nitrate reaching groundwater. The District submitted Containment and Remediation Plan Supplement No. 4, which included an updated mathematical modeling and analysis plan of cleanup alternatives. Some concentrations of nitrate (as N) exceeding 7 to 8 mg/L remain at the end of the 55-year simulation period, for all alternatives including the Aggressive Remediation Alternative. The concentrations and extent of nitrate in groundwater are predicted to decrease relatively slowly during the last 20 years of the simulated period for all four alternatives. As an interim remedial measure, the District has implemented the alternative that includes improved effluent

management, construction and operation of six aroundwater extraction wells, and natural attenuation. Improved effluent management has occurred through expansion of the agricultural reuse site and construction of winter effluent storage reservoirs so that effluent is applied to crops at agronomic rates. This practice has been in effect since 2010. In March 2012. Prosecution Team Staff released a draft CAO that would replace the original CAO and authorize the Interim Measure to continue. Prosecution Team Staff withdrew the draft to consider issues raised by the responsible parties and the Water Board's Advisory Team. Water Board staff anticipates a new draft to be released for public review at least 60 days prior to the September 2012 Water Board Meeting.

#### **Status of Task Completions**

A table showing the status of compliance with the Water Board order is included at the end of this report.

#### 15. County Sanitation District No. 14 of Los Angeles County (District), Lancaster Water Reclamation Plant, Los Angeles County – *Mike Coony*

The District discharges secondary treated effluent to Piute Ponds (also known as Paiute Ponds). The District cannot contain all of the effluent, and therefore releases effluent into Rosamond Dry Lake. The Air Force has indicated that effluent in the lakebed interferes with base flight operations. Therefore, WDRs adopted in 2002 required the District to eliminate overflows by August 2005. The District proposed a project that consists of 1) plant upgrade to tertiary treatment, 2) land site for agricultural reuse, and 3) impoundments for winter storage. When it became known that the District could not comply with the final WDR

compliance date, the Water Board issued a Cease and Desist Order (CDO) in 2004 and an amended CDO in 2007. Under the amended CDO, the District was required to eliminate effluent-induced overflows by November 1, 2010, by completing the project as originally proposed or through an alternate method.

The District did not complete its planned treatment plant upgrade by November 1, 2010, and was unable to store treated secondary wastewater in its storage ponds. However, the District implemented an alternate method during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 winter seasons. The alternate method was to assist the Air Force's study to evaluate the Piute Pond habitat and Rosamond Dry Lake habitat through a set of seasonal flushing tests in 2010 and 2011 at Piute Ponds.

Because the District's discharges to Piute Ponds are consistent with the terms of the Air Force study, Water Board staff believes that the alternate method resulted in no effluent-induced overflows during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 winter seasons. Therefore, Water Board staff concludes that the District complied with both the interim requirements and has been in compliance with its WDRs since November 1, 2010.

The District completed the treatment plant upgrade on May 18, 2012 and intends to have the upgrade fully operational by July 30, 2012.

#### **Status of Task Completions**

A table showing the status of compliance is included at the end of the report.

### SCHEDULE OF TASKS PALMDALE WATER RECLAMATION PLANT (PWRP) COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 20 OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY (DISTRICT)

| PERFORMANCE TASK   | DUE DATE  | STATUS                   |  |  |
|--|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| Required by Cleanup and Abatement Order R6V 2003-056   |   |                          |  |  |
| Plume Delineation  |   |                          |  |  |
| 1.1.1 – Submit a plan to delineate the nitrate plume to background levels  | Feb 16,<br>2004   | Met                      |  |  |
| 1.1.2 – Complete plume delineation   | Aug 15,<br>2004   | Met                      |  |  |
| Plume Containment  |   |                          |  |  |
| 1.2.2 - Submit a final plan (including extraction well locations and pumping rates) and time schedule for containing the plume   | Sept 15,<br>2004  | Met                      |  |  |
| 1.2.3 – Achieve plume containment  | Sept 30,<br>2005  | Not met                  |  |  |
| Plume Remediation  |   |                          |  |  |
| <ul> <li>1.3.1 - Submit a plan describing the proposed plume<br/>remediation describing how ground water will be<br/>restored to background or propose alternative<br/>cleanup levels pursuant to SWRCB Resolution 92-<br/>49</li> </ul> | Sept 15,<br>2004  | Not met - In progress    |  |  |
| 1.3.2 – Implement the proposed plan for ground water extraction and agricultural irrigation (or an equally acceptable alternative)   | Sept 15,<br>2005  | Not met — In<br>progress |  |  |
| Abatement  |   |                          |  |  |
| 2.1 – Submit a plan describing proposed abatement actions  | March 31,<br>2004                                       | Met                      |  |  |
| <b>Reporting</b><br>3.2 – Submit quarterly status reports until<br>remediation is complete including actions completed<br>in the last three months and expected in the next<br>three months report                                       | February 1,<br>May 1,<br>August 1,<br>and<br>November 1 | Ongoing                  |  |  |

| Required by: Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R6V-2011-0012  |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Provide revisions to Sample and Analysis Plan at least 30 days before implementation   | When<br>revised   | Met                                    |  |  |
| II.B.5 – Submit an Annual Cropping Plan  | Nov 15 of<br>each year  | Ongoing                                |  |  |
| <ul> <li>II.B.1 – Submit monthly monitoring reports for</li> <li>Flow Monitoring</li> <li>Influent Monitoring Report</li> <li>Effluent Monitoring Report</li> <li>Operation and Maintenance Report</li> <li>Recycled Water Treatment and Use Report</li> </ul>   | 15 <sup>th</sup> working<br>day of the<br>second<br>month<br>following<br>each<br>monthly<br>monitoring<br>period   | Ongoing                                |  |  |
| <ul> <li>II.B.3 – Submit quarterly reports for</li> <li>Groundwater Monitoring Report</li> <li>Groundwater Extraction Operations Report</li> <li>Agricultural Site Monitoring Report</li> <li>Agricultural Vadose Zone Monitoring Report</li> <li>Agricultural Site Monitoring, Operations, and</li> <li>Chemical Use Monitoring Report</li> <li>Chemical Use Monitoring Report</li> <li>Storage Reservoir Site Vadose Zone Monitoring</li> <li>Report</li> <li>Biosolids Storage and Disposal Report</li> </ul> | 15 <sup>th</sup> working<br>day of the<br>second<br>month<br>following<br>each<br>quarterly<br>monitoring<br>period | Ongoing                                |  |  |
| II.B.4. – Submit annual reports for<br>- Treatment plant<br>- Groundwater monitoring   | March 1 <sup>st</sup> of<br>each year   | Ongoing                                |  |  |
| Required by Resolution No. R6V-2005-0010   |   |  |  |  |
| A Discharger should initiate cleanup project to reduce nitrate concentrations in groundwater to less than 10 mg/L as N, as soon as possible  | As soon as possible   | In progress                            |  |  |
| B Discharger should submit an evaluation for<br>additional options for remediation of groundwater<br>after the 10 mg/L as N level is achieved. Focus<br>should be on less than 2 mg/L as N (background),<br>which will be used to establish the final cleanup<br>standard  | Apr 13,<br>2006   | Not met — further<br>analysis on-going |  |  |

#### SCHEDULE OF TASKS LANCASTER WATER RECLAMATION PLANT (LWRP) COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 14 OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY (DISTRICT)

| PERFORMANCE TASK   | DUE DATE   | STATUS  |
|--|--|---|
| Required by Waste Discharge Requirements<br>Board Order R6V 2002-053<br>Board Order R6V 2002-053A1 (Adopted 7/13/2005)                   |  |   |
| Nuisance Condition   |  |   |
| II.B.4 Complete project to eliminate nuisance<br>condition created by effluent induced overflow from<br>Piute Ponds to Rosamond Dry Lake | August 25,<br>2005   | (Extended under<br>Cease and Desist<br>Order R6V-2004-<br>0038A1) |
| Required by: Waste Discharge Requirements<br>Board Order R6V 2002-053A2 (Adopted 3/14/2007)  |  |   |
| Engineering Reports (Tertiary Treatment Plants)  |  |   |
| II.B.1. – Acceptance of engineering report for 15-mgd tertiary treatment plant by Executive Officer.                                     | Before<br>discharging<br>from plant                            | Report submitted,<br>Public Health<br>reviewing report.           |
| II.B.2. – Acceptance of engineering report for MBR tertiary treatment plant with UV disinfection by Executive Officer.                   | Before<br>discharging<br>from UV system                        | Issued July 9, 2009   |
| Farm Management Plan (Agricultural Site)   |  |   |
| II.C.1. – Submit farm management plant for Fields 7<br>& 8, and 11 – 20  | Submit report<br>nine months<br>before irrigation<br>in fields | Met   |
| Vadose Zone Monitoring (Agricultural Site)   |  |   |
| II.D.1. – Submit vadose zone monitoring plan (if an alternate plan is proposed) for Fields 1 - 6, 9 & 10                                 | June 14, 2007  | Met   |
| II.D.1. – Implement vadose zone monitoring plan for<br>Fields 1 - 6, 9 & 10  | March 14, 2008   | Met   |
| I.H.3. (MRP) – Submit vadose zone monitoring plan<br>for Fields 7 & 8 and 11 – 20  | One year before<br>irrigation                                  | Met   |
| Groundwater Monitoring (Agricultural Site)   |  |   |
| II.E.1. – Complete groundwater sampling for data<br>needed to calculate existing water quality for Fields 1<br>through 8                 | June 30, 2007  | Met   |
| II.E.1 Submit results of calculations for determining existing water quality for Fields 1 through 8                                      | October 30,<br>2007  | Met   |
| II.E.2.a Submit workplan for installing additional monitoring wells for Fields 9 through 12  | April 20, 2007   | Met   |
| II.E.2.a Complete installation of additional<br>monitoring wells for Fields 9 through 12   | June 15, 2007  | Met   |

| PERFORMANCE TASK   | DUE DATE  | STATUS   |
|--|---|--|
| II.E.2.b. – Complete groundwater sampling for data<br>needed to calculate existing water quality for Fields 9<br>through 12        | September 30,<br>2007   | Met  |
| II.E.2.b Submit results of calculations for<br>determining existing water quality for Fields 9 through<br>12                       | January 30,<br>2008   | Met  |
| II.E.3.a Submit workplan for installing additional monitoring wells for Fields 13 through 20                                       | Submit report<br>one year before<br>irrigation in<br>fields     | Met  |
| II.E.3.b Submit results of calculations for<br>determining existing water quality for Fields 13<br>through 20                      | Complete<br>before irrigation<br>in fields                      | Met (Submitted on<br>Mar 29, 2011)                             |
| Abandoned Wells (Agricultural Site)  |   |  |
| <ul> <li>II.F. – Submit report demonstrating that destruction of abandoned wells have been completed for Fields 13 – 20</li> </ul> | Submit report<br>three months<br>before irrigation<br>in fields | Met (Submitted Feb<br>7, 2011)                                 |
| Run On and Run Off Controls (Agricultural Site)  |   |  |
| II.G.1. – Submit report demonstrating that run on and/or run off controls have been implemented for Fields 1 - 6                   | Submit report<br>one month<br>before irrigation<br>in fields    | Met  |
| II.G.1. – Submit report demonstrating that run on and/or run off controls have been implemented for Fields 7 - 20                  | Submit report<br>one month<br>before irrigation<br>in fields    | Submitted report for<br>Fields 11 and 12                       |
| Required by: Waste Discharge Requirements<br>Board Order R6V 2006-0051   |   |  |
| II.A Submit workplan for installing additional monitoring wells for the proposed storage reservoirs                                | April 9, 2007   | Met (Submitted 16 days late)                                   |
| II.B.1 - Submit the final design for the proposed storage reservoirs   | Before<br>constructing the<br>reservoirs                        | Met  |
| II.B.2 - Submit a construction QA/QC program for the<br>proposed storage reservoirs  | Before<br>constructing the<br>reservoirs                        | Met  |
| II.B.3 - Submit certification that proposed reservoirs were constructed as proposed  | Before use of the reservoirs                                    | Met (Submitted<br>Apr 13, 2011 and<br>accepted Dec 9,<br>2011) |

| Required by: Cease and Desist Orders<br>Board Order R6V-2004-0038<br>Board Order R6V-2004-0038A1 (Adopted 11/29/2007)  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| I.A. – Divert 24 MG of effluent and discharge to an alternative legal disposal point (e.g., Apollo Park) other than Piute Ponds (Note: Contained in R6V-2004-0038. Not rescinded.)   | Between<br>December 1,<br>2004 and Mar 31,<br>2005             | Less than 24 MG diverted  |
| II.A. – Divert 192 MG of effluent that would otherwise<br>be discharged to Piute Ponds and dispose of this<br>volume at an alternative legal point of disposal.  | Between April 1<br>and October 31 of<br>each year              | Met. * -2008,<br>diverted 274 MG. *<br>-2009, diverted<br>242 MG. * -2010,<br>diverted 207.5<br>MG. * -2011,<br>diverted 198.4<br>MG.   |
| II.B. – Divert the effluent volume (calculated as<br>specified in CDO) that would otherwise be<br>discharged to Piute Ponds and dispose of this<br>volume at an alternative legal point of disposal.<br>Calculated volume equals 156 MG minus an<br>adjustment if there is above-average rainfall. | Between<br>November 1 and<br>March 31 of the<br>following year | Met in 2007-08,<br>2008-09, and<br>2009-10, 2010-11,<br>and 2011-12.  |
| III. – Eliminate the effluent-induced overflows from<br>Piute Ponds to Rosamond Dry Lake   | November 1,<br>2010  | Met using<br>alternate method.<br>Winter 2010-11<br>and 2011-12<br>overflows occurred<br>only when Air<br>Force requested<br>overflows. |
| <ul> <li>V. – Submit quarterly status reports until final<br/>compliance achieved</li> </ul>   | February 1, May<br>1, August 1, and<br>November 1              | Ongoing   |