Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Comments Received on June 4th (verbal), June 10th (written), and June 11th (verbal), 2008 from Ojai Valley Sanitary District Regarding the Tentative Dated May 19, 2008						
Typo	1	"Sanitation District" should be changed to "Sanitary District"	x		The text was revised.	Revised text.
Clarification	2	"Primary sludge" should be changed to "primary screenings", to more accurately reflect operations.	x		The text was revised.	Revised text.
typo	3	The monthly average limit for ammonia nitrogen is noted as 3.0 in some places and 1.6 in other places. According to the calculation shown in the Tentative, it should be 3.0.	x		The typo was revised, to reflect 3.0, consistently throughout the Tentative Permit and the Fact Sheet.	Revised text.
Turbidity	4	Where does the "10 NTU at any time" come from?			The Discharger submitted a ROWD for permit renewal which included filtration as a treatment unit. What the Regional Board is requiring of the Discharger is that they properly operate and maintain their existing equipment, including but not limited to the filters. The turbidity requirements are included in the permit for human health protection. USEPA's 1986 Quality Criteria for Water references a maximum limit of 1 NTU for turbidity, where water enters a distribution system. The USEPA document also discusses the link that exists between health considerations, turbidity, and effective chlorine disinfection. Suspended matter provides areas where micro-organisms do not come in contact with	None necessary

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					chlorine disinfectant. The turbidity limit is consistent with other permits written for facilities that have filtration as a treatment process.	
Turbidity	5	The OVSD representatives expressed concerns about the 3 limits for turbidity (P. 16, section IV.2.e) and the possibility of multiple violations for the same event, especially under the Migden penalty. According to the OVSD, under normal operations, achieving all three limits this is not a concern; however, under heavy storms, because the filters have limited capacity and because the sampling probes are located immediately downstream of the filters and upstream of the UV disinfection, there was a concern as to whether the turbidity limits could be met at that point. The equalization ponds have limited capacity and are not capable of handling very large storms.		X	As discussed at the meeting on June 11, 2008, the sampling should be conducted at a point that would yield samples representative of the effluent leaving the plant and entering the waterbody. One potential scenario, in event of a very heavy storm, is that some of the flow might result in bypassing the filters, and perhaps sampling could be conducted at the point where the bypass and the filtered flow commingle, via manual sampling. It is important that the turbidity limits are met at the point, prior to the flow entering the Ventura River.	None necessary
100-year return storm	6	The Discharger expressed a concern regarding the standard language in p. 23 VI.A.2.c about the 100 year storm event and the impact of such events on the trunk lines. The treatment plant is built for protection against such storms; however, there are concerns about the trunk lines that are old and located near the Ventura River.	X		The relevant text was revised to reflect that "all facilities used for collection and transport shall be adequately protected against damage resulting from overflow, washout, or inundation. The treatment plant shall be adequately protected against 100-year return, 24-hour duration storm."	Revised text.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Graphical error	7	Attachment C- The flow schematic shows solids process flow, but should show liquid process flow.	X		The solids process flow was replaced with the liquid process flow.	Replaced flow schematic.
Upset	8	The Discharger requested an explanation in plain language the phrase underlined (from Attachment D.I.H.1, Page D-3): "1.Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions - Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).)."			A verbal and written explanation was provided to the Discharger that it basically means that a determination that an upset did or did not occur is not final, and may not be challenged in court, except and until the determination is made during an enforcement action for noncompliance with technology based effluent limits.	None necessary
Monitoring schedule	9	The proposed quarterly monitoring schedule does not follow the existing schedule.	X		Changed the monitoring schedule back to old schedule- February, May, August, November.	Text revised.
ELAP certification	10	To whom and how frequency should a copy of the laboratory certification be provided each time a new certification and/or renewal of the certification is obtained from ELAP.	X		Appropriate text was added to the pertinent section to clarify that the information is to be submitted to the Regional Board, as part of the Annual Report.	Text added.
Endocrine disrupting chemicals and pharmaceuticals	11	Since there are no USEPA-approved analytical methods for endocrine disrupting chemicals and pharmaceuticals, the sampling method should be decided when USEPA-approved analytical methods	X		The effluent monitoring (Table 3) was revised such that the sampling type for the two categories of chemicals now reads, "to be decided".	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		become available.				
Total flow	12	The total flow monitoring under the receiving water monitoring should be "grab" as in the existing permit, not "calculation".	X		The typo was corrected to reflect "grab", to be consistent with the existing permit.	Text revised.
Remaining EPA priority pollutants	13	The receiving water monitoring for the remaining EPA priority pollutants should be grab, not 24-hour composite, given the sampling in the receiving water is such that it is not feasible to collect 24-hour composites.	X		Table 4a for receiving water monitoring was revised so that the remaining EPA priority pollutants may be grab sampled. This is consistent with other recently adopted POTW permits.	Text revised.
Tertiary filter treatment bypass	14	In a tertiary filter treatment bypass event, the effluent has already gone through the secondary treatment and oil and grease should be non-detect. The tertiary filter targets primarily solids. Therefore, delete oil and grease (effluent) daily monitoring associated with tertiary filter treatment bypass.	X		The reference to oil and grease was deleted from the daily effluent monitoring requirement under the tertiary filter treatment bypass section	Text deleted.
Tertiary filter treatment bypass	15	The language regarding the reporting associated with tertiary filter treatment bypass is confusing. It reads as if the daily effluent monitoring results should be reported as soon as they become available- does that mean daily submittal is required?	X		The pertinent text was revised to clarify that the results from the daily effluent monitoring shall be verbally reported to the Regional Water Board as the results become available and submitted as part of the monthly self monitoring report.	Text revised.
Typo- reporting schedule	16	The SMR due date for monthly monitoring in the existing order is 15th day of the second month after the month of sampling, while the Tentative refers to the 15th day of the third month after sampling. Prefer to keep it the same for consistency.	X		The SMR due date for monthly monitoring was revised to keep it consistent with the requirement in the existing order- i.e. the 15th day of the second month after the month of sampling	Text revised.
Service areas	17	Please add North Ventura Avenue area as one of the	X		The reference to North Ventura Avenue	Text added.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		service areas.			area was appropriately inserted.	
Discharge Points and Receiving Water	18	The description of the watershed-wide monitoring efforts should be updated, especially the role played by OVSD.	X		Please submit a written update of the watershed-wide monitoring efforts should be updated, especially the role played by OVSD.	Awaiting response.
Clarification	19	Please revise to language pertaining to grit removal and screening to clarify that grit is removed by settling, and rags and plastics by screening.	X		The appropriate text was revised.	Text revised.
Iron- typo	20	Iron is listed twice in the Fact Sheet, under Table 2 (Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data). Please check and delete one.	X		On June 19, 2008, the Discharger sent the original lab sheet (reported 0.07 mg/L) for iron sample on 5/11/2005, in order to correct the typo in the self monitoring report (reported 0.7 mg/L). The first entry of iron (average monthly of 300 ug/L and highest average monthly average and highest daily discharge of 230 ug/L) was revised such that both the average monthly and highest daily discharge now read 0.14 mg/L. With the correction of the typo, the RPA was performed again, and since there is no reasonable potential, the limit was deleted from Table 6a (page 15) and Table 8 (Summary of Final Effluent Limitations, F-42)	Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) revised. Limit for iron deleted from Table 6a and Table 8.
Typo- TSO Order/ nitrate	21	Under the TSO Order description, the reference to nitrate and nitrite appears to be a typo.	X		Removed the reference to nitrate and nitrite.	Text deleted.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
and nitrite						
Temperature/ aquatic life	22	The exiting permit indicated 100ºF as the maximum effluent temperature limitation. Why is the new requirement of 86ºF in place?			The change from 100ºF to 86ºF is explained in the Tentative Permit, and is based on the findings in a white paper developed by the Regional Board staff, titled, Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen Impact on Biota in Tidal Estuaries and Enclosed Bays in the Los Angeles Region, which found 86ºF temperature to be protective of aquatic organisms.	None necessary.
Typo- Chronic toxicity trigger	23	The tentative permit has a chronic toxicity trigger of 1.0 TUc, which is mentioned as a limit in some places in the permit. There is a typo in the tentative on F-36, which reads that neither a maximum daily limitation nor a trigger for chronic toxicity is prescribed.	X		Reference to 1 TUc has been changed to read as a trigger for a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), not a limit. The typo on Page F-36 has been deleted.	Text deleted.
Typo- total inorganic nitrogen	24	On page F-22, X.(b), the limit for total inorganic nitrogen based on the Basin Plan should be 10 mg/L, not 8 mg/L	X		8 mg/L was replaced with 10 mg/L.	Text revised.
Typo- Lower Ventura River	25	On. Page F-34, V.B, in the last sentence of the paragraph, the reference to lower Ventura River Basin being used for drinking water supply is incorrect.	X		The word “lower” was deleted.	Text deleted.
Clarification- toxicity test	26	On page E-16, G.4, is a compliance summary of last eleven samples necessary, and is this a rolling summary? What is the benefit?		X	A compliance summary of the last eleven samples is necessary, and this refers to a rolling summary. The purpose is to provide a concise overview of the toxicity results for	None necessary.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					the last 11 months.	
Typo- footnote	27	Page 14-15, Limitations and Discharge requirements (Table 6a), footnote 9 should be footnote 1.	X		The reference to footnote 9 was replaced with footnote 1.	Text revised.
Residual chlorine	28	Page 14- The old permit had a footnote for residual chlorine, allowing 0.3 mg/L for 15 minutes maximum. This is not in the new permit.			The total residual chlorine (TRC) may not exceed the effluent limit of 0.1 mg/L. Table 3 in the Attachment E was revised by adding footnote 6, which reads, "Continuous monitoring of TRC at the current location shall serve as an internal trigger for increased TRC end of pipe grab sampling if either of the following occur, except as noted in footnote 9.c: a. TRC concentration excursions of up to 0.3 mg/L lasting greater than 15 minutes; or b. TRC concentration peaks in excess of 0.3 mg/L lasting greater than 1 minute. c. Additional end of pipe grab samples need not be taken if it can be demonstrated that a stoichiometrically appropriate amount of dechlorination chemical has been added to effectively dechlorinate the effluent to 0.1 mg/L or less for peaks in excess of 0.3 mg/L lasting more than 1 minute, but not for more than five minutes."	Footnote added.
Receiving water stations	29	R3, R4, and R5 are now RSW 1, RSW 2, and RSW 3, respectively. Please change back to R3, R4, and R5,	X		For consistency the station numbers in the existing permit will be maintained, and	Receiving surface

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		for consistency. R4 is still designated at 50 feet downstream of discharge (page 19, 25.c and E-5 Table1). The Regional Board staff should be aware of the reality of the altered river flow varies the actual confluence/mixing zone and samples are collected further downstream.			preceded by RSW (receiving surface water), for consistency with the statewide NPDES permit template. Therefore, the tentative permit now refers to RSW 3, RSW 4, and RSW 5. In terms of the evolving hydromorphology affecting the actual sampling location, the Discharger should conduct sampling at locations that will ensure that the samples are representative of the effluent that has mixed with the receiving water and upstream of other inputs into the waterbody.	Water station numbers changed.
TRE workplan	30	Page 27.2.a requires a submittal of a TRE Workplan within 90 days. One was submitted under the last permit.			The tentative permit requires that the TRE workplan be submitted (again) within 90 days of the effective date of this permit.	None necessary.
Chain of custody	31	Chain of custody (COC) must be included with monthly reports. This results in significant increase in paper for no purpose- COC's are available, and they are not required with electronic CIWQS reporting- is this necessary?			The COCs are the first documentation checked by the Regional Board staff when reviewing monitoring reports. COCs document from the time when the sample was obtained until the time of receipt from the laboratory and are necessary to see if the sample(s) were handled properly.	None necessary.
Increased effluent monitoring frequency	32	The following sampling ha increased in frequency, which will increase expenses: effluent: sulfate, chloride, and boron increased from annual to quarterly. TDS has increased from semiannual to quarterly. Fluoride has decreased from semiannual to			The tentative permit contains effluent limits for sulfate, chloride, boron, and total dissolved solids (TDS), which are based on the Basin Plan objectives. Constituents with an effluent limitation need to be	None necessary

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		annual. Total hardness testing is a new requirement.			monitored more often than twice a year. Fluoride, a water quality objective based on Title 22, has no reasonable potential, and thus no limit. Therefore, the monitoring frequency is set at semi-annual, an increase from the annual frequency in the existing permit. The total hardness testing is a new requirement that applies to all POTW NPDES permits. For CTR metals, both the CTR criteria and the effluent limits must be calculated using the hardness values.	
Chlorpyrifos and diazinon	33	Regional Board staff indicated in a past communication that the monitoring requirement for chloropyrifos and diazinon was dropped per the footnote in the 2003 permit (no detection in 2 years). Now they are back in the 2008 permit- is this an error?	X		Regional Board staff agree. Neither of these constituents have been detected. Therefore the monitoring requirement will be dropped.	Change has been made.
Typo- emerging chemicals	34	Regarding emerging chemicals footnote 12: specific test methods are called out now for several constituents. It calls for using USEPA method 9260B for testing MTBE. There is no method 9260B. It should read 8260B.	X		The reference to 9260B has been replaced with 8260B.	Text revised.
Receiving water monitoring frequency	35	Page E-16-18: The following sampling has increased in frequency, which will increase expenses: Receiving water: TDS, sulfate, chloride, 2,3,4,8 TCDD, and all other priority pollutants were annual and are now semiannual. Priority pollutant are now		X	TDS, sulfate, chloride, 2,3,4,8 TCDD, and all other priority pollutants are now semiannual to better evaluate water quality impact. The priority pollutant testing is required for all stations, to provide the	Frequency revised for Nitrate-N, MBAS and CTAS.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		required for all stations where they were only required for R3 and R3 before. This will be a major expense. Boron is a new testing requirement. Nitrate-N was quarterly and is now semiannual while all other nutrients are still quarterly. MBAS and CTA were semiannual and are now quarterly.	 X		minimum data necessary for the reasonable potential analysis (RPA). Boron monitoring has been added since there is a effluent limit for boron. Nitrate-N frequency (typo) was changed back to quarterly. MBAS and CTAS monitoring has been changed from quarterly to semiannual since there is no RP.	Others remain unchanged.
Footnote 19	36	Footnote 19 is cutoff mid-sentence. References to footnote 13 should be footnote 16.	X		Footnote 19 has been appropriately revised. References to footnote 13 have been replaced with footnote 16.	Text revised.
Duplicative receiving water monitoring	37	Page E-18, Table 4d: Almost all of the metals in this table are also listed as priority pollutants in 40 CFR Part 423-126 Appendix A. In this table, it requires R1 and R3 to be checked for these annually. In Table 4a, all river stations are required to be tested for priority pollutants semi-annually. If these metals are priority pollutants, which schedule is correct?	X		Table 4d overlaps with Table 4a and has been revised so that only aluminum, cobalt, iron, molybdenum and vanadium remain.	Text revised.
River mouth sandbar monitoring	38	There is still a requirement to check the status of the river mouth sandbar. We have not done this since we dropped most river stations in 2003. This is a carry over and should be removed.	X		The tidal and sand bar observation was to be performed concurrently with sampling. With the removal of receiving water stations near the estuary in 2003 Permit, it seems reasonable to remove the tidal and sandbar observation since the staff would have to travel down to the estuary to make the observation, which was not the intent of the	Text deleted.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					original requirement. VII.A.5.g and j removed.	
Name change	39	Ventura County Flood Control District is now Ventura County Watershed Protection District. This should be corrected.	X		The name has been appropriately updated.	Text revised.
Monitoring and reporting frequency	40	Under quarterly, sampling period begins on… it states "closest of February 1, May 1, August 1 or November 1 following (or on) permit effective date". Does this mean there is no October quarterlies required for 2008 since this will be before November 1?		X	Refer to response #8. The quarterly monitoring frequency has been restored to be consistent with the existing permit.	None necessary.
RPA	41	Page E-25.D.1: There is a requirement for a "Reasonable Potential Analysis" section to be included with the Annual Report. How detailed does this need to be?			The Regional Board provided direction for staff to add the requirement for the Yearly RPA to be performed by the dischargers. The purpose is to see if there is RP for any additional constituents not covered by the NPDES. If there is RP, then the Regional Board staff will re-open the permit under the provisions of the reopener clauses to add an enforceable limit. The scope of the technical report on page E-26 D.1. is clearly identified by elements specified in a. through d.. These are minimum requirements, and the Discharger is free to expand beyond these requirements.	None necessary.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Typo- Oil and Grease	42	Page F-7 Table 2: Table lists the highest daily discharge for oil and grease to be 3.0. This is incorrect. It should be ND. The data summary submitted to the Regional Board had one sample in 2003 listed as <3. This must have been seen as a 3.	X		This typo has been revised from 3.0 to ND in Table 2.	Text revised.
Iron reporting	43	Page F-7 Table 2: The highest (past) daily discharge for iron should be 0.14, not 0.7.		X	Please refer to response #20.	MEC revised. Limit for iron deleted from Table 6a and Table 8.
Mercury	44	Page F-7 Table 2: Mercury's high should be 3.0 not 3.9. These were typos in the data summary sent.			In reviewing Table 2, it is clear that this comment is regarding selenium, not mercury. The highest value for selenium (5/10/2006) was 3.0. The typo was revised from 3.9 to 3.0.	MEC for selenium revised.
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate	45	Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate high should be 8.9, not 24. The 24 is from a composite test, which is not valid as we are required to report grabs.	X		The MEC for bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate high was revised from 24 to 8.9. The initial RPA was performed using 8.9, and the limit remains.	Text revised.
Algal Biomass units	46	Footnote 19 needs clarification. It currently reads, "algal biomass as Chlorophyll a".	X		The footnote has been revised to read, "Algal biomass or Chlorophyll *a* samples shall be collected by obtaining scrapings from the substrate, concurrently with pH and dissolved oxygen monitoring. This will be a measure of benthic algae, rather than	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					algae in the water column. Percent cover shall also be reported."	
Written Comments Received on June 19, 2008 from Ojai Valley Sanitary District Regarding the Tentative Dated May 19, 2008						
Typo	50	(#1- refers to the comment number in the table of comments submitted by the Discharger) **Request**: Throughout all documents, as necessary, change the following: "Sanitation District" to "Sanitary District" "Primary sludge is" to "Primary Screenings are"	X		Please see responses #1 & #2.	Text revised.
Typo	51	**(#2, Section I)** **Comment**: The correct last name of the facility contact is Ron Sheet**s**, not "Sheet." **Request**: Change "Sheet" to "Sheets"	X		Typo corrected.	Text revised..
Clarification	52	**(#3, Section** II.B) **Comment**: Reference to "primary sedimentation" should read "grit removal and screening." **Request**: Please revise language per above comment.	X		Please see responses #2.	Text revised.
Total residual chlorine	53	(#4, Section IV.A.1, Table 6a) **Comment:** We thank Regional Board staff for partly addressing the residual chlorine effluent limit at our June 11 meeting as reflected in the meeting notes provided to us by Cathy Chang. We agree that the		X	Please see responses #28.	Footnote inserted.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		0.3 mg/L should serve as an internal trigger for increased sampling. However, we do not agree that the 0.1 mg/L limit should reflect an absolute limit, and believe footnote [4] in Table 6a in our current permit should remain, as revised to reflect the trigger elements in the June 11 meeting notes. **Request:** Please reinstate the 0.3 mg/L residual chlorine limit for durations up to 15 minutes.				
Typo	54	(#5, Section IV.A.1.c, Table 6a) **Comment**: Section IV.A.1.c should be deleted because there is no lead effluent limit. **Request**: Remove Section IV.1.c.	X		We agree that the reference to lead is a typo; in its place, we added reference to bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, which has RP and thus, a limit.	Text revised.
Typo	55	(#6, Section IV.A.1) **Comment:** There is no footnote 9 as referenced in the table. The footnote reference is probably a typo that should be a "1" instead. **Request:** Please change footnote appropriately.	X		Please see responses #28.	Text revised.
Ammonia	56	**(#7, Section** IV.A.1 Table 6a & Attachment F Table 8) **Comment:** Ammonia has no reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objectives. The MEC is 0.6 mg/L and the most stringent objective (using effluent		X	Ammonia is assigned a limit for several reasons. First, ammonia is a conventional pollutant and not a toxic pollutant covered under the provisions of the SIP, and is therefore not subject to the RPA procedure. Moreover, ammonia is part of the Basin	None necessary

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		pH = 7.9 and temperature 22C) is 1.73 mg/L. **Request:** Remove the ammonia effluent limits from Table 6a and from Fact Sheet Table 8.			Plan objectives. Therefore, similar to TDS, chloride and boron, a limit is assigned for ammonia. A third reason is that OVSD has a biological treatment system that is subject to changes in the treatment process due to a number of factors such as temperature, change in bacterial die-off, etc. Therefore, it is reasonable to think that ammonia can be present in concentrations above the Basin Plan Objectives (BPOs) if the treatment system is not working as it should.	
Mercury	57	(#8, Sectionn IV.A.1.c Table 6a &Attachment F Table 8) **Comment:** The mercury MEC in Table R1 is an error. The value of 0.81 ug/L listed for 11/9/05 is actually a lead value. The correct mercury result for 11/9/05 is 0.0009 ug/L. Therefore, the MEC for mercury is 0.0022 ug/L, which does not trigger reasonable potential using the most stringent objective of 0.051 ug/L. **Request:** Correct Table R1, and remove the mercury effluent limits from Table 6a and from Fact Sheet Table 8.			The value for mercury MEC of 0.81 ug/L listed for 11/9/05, was actually a lead value. The correct mercury result for 11/9/05 is 0.0009 ug/L. The MEC for mercury, after this change is 0.0028 ug/L (not 0.0022 ug/L, as stated in the Discharger's comment). The RPA was run again, using this updated MEC. There is no reasonable potential and the limit for mercury was removed.	MEC for mercury updated, and limit removed.
Iron	58	(#9, Section IV.A.1.c Table 6a & Attachment F Table 8) **Comment:** The iron MEC in Table R2 is an error.		X	Please refer to response #20.	MEC revised. Limit for

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		The value of 0.7 mg/L listed for 5/11/05 should be 0.07 mg/L. Therefore, the projected MEC for iron is 0.14 mg/L, which does not trigger reasonable potential using the most stringent objective of 0.3 mg/L (secondary MCL). **Request:** Correct Table R2, and remove the iron effluent limits from Table 6a and from Fact Sheet Table 8.				iron deleted from Table 6a and Table 8.
Turbidity	59	(#10, Section IV.A.2.e) **Comment**: Section IV.A.2.e provides that "[f]or the protection of the water contact recreation beneficial use, the wastes discharged to water courses shall have received adequate treatment, so that the turbidity of the treated wastewater does not exceed: (a) an average of 2 Nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs) within a 24 hour period; (b) 5 NTUs more than 5 percent of the time (72 minutes) during any 24 hour period; and (c) 10 NTUs at any time." The concerns about this limit expressed to the Regional Board staff at our June 11, 2008 meeting are adopted by reference as delineated in the Regional Board staff's notes for that meeting dated June 11. Despite any conclusions drawn from our June 11 meeting, the District believes this turbidity limit is		X	Please refer to response #4.	None necessary

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		inconsistent with the intent behind Water Code 13261, which provides that requirements prescribed on waste discharge permits shall implement relevant basin plans and consider beneficial uses to be protected and water quality objectives. Specifically, the effluent limit is not based on an established water quality objective. Instead, it appears to based the definition of "filtered wastewater" contained in uniform statewide water recycling criteria section of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which is applicable only to reclamation projects (*i.e.*, the beneficial reuse of recycled water, such as agricultural and landscape irrigation), not to surface water discharges. *See* 22 CCR §60301.320(a)(2)(A)-(C). Water quality objectives are established to ensure that *reasonable* protection of beneficial uses. (See Water Code section 13241; see also EPA's Water Quality Standards Regulation at 40 CFR 131.11(a)). To protect the recreational use designations, the Tentative Order correctly includes receiving water limitations based on the Basin Plan's water quality objective for turbidity. This objective recites the secondary drinking water standard for turbidity of 5 NTU pursuant to 22 CCR §64448, and also prescribes the following requirements: "Where				

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		natural turbidity is between 0 and 50 NTU, increases shall not exceed 20%. Where natural turbidity is greater than 50 NTU, increases shall not exceed 10%. Allowable zones of dilution within which higher concentrations may be tolerated may be defined for each discharge in specific Waste Discharge Requirements." *See* Basin Plan at 3-17. Based on the above observations, despite the proper recitation of the receiving water limit for turbidity, the effluent limitations for turbidity imposed at Section IV.A.2.e. are improper because they do not correlate to the water quality objective for turbidity as provided in Water Code §13263. **Request:** The effluent limitations for turbidity should be removed, or, at the very least, be equivalent to the secondary drinking water standard for turbidity of 5 NTU (i.e. equivalent to the receiving water turbidity limitation). If the Regional Board is unwilling to make this change, we request the following: • Amend the turbidity discharge limit as follows: "For the protection of water contact recreation beneficial use… the turbidity of the treated wastewater				

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		does not exceed: (a) ~~an~~ a monthly average of 2 Nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs) ~~within a 24 hour period~~…" • The Regional Board establish a comprehensive rationale for the limit in the Fact Sheet and provide evidence in the administrative record that suggests the effluent limitations for turbidity are necessary to protect the water contact recreation beneficial use.				
Chronic Toxicity Trigger	60	(#11, Section IV.A.2.h.b) **Comment:** The District understands the Regional Board has agreed to delete the numerical chronic toxicity limitation in Section IV.A.2.h.b as a result of our June 11 meeting. We could not find reference to this commitment in the Regional Board's written notes for that meeting so we specifically reiterate our concerns here. Section IV.A.2.h.b proposes a monthly median toxicity "limit" of 1.0 TUc or a daily maximum of 2.0 TUc in a critical life stage test. This requirement appears to left over from the District's current permit	X		Please see response #23	Text revised.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		before it was amended by Resolution R4-2004-0121, which deleted the requirement replacing it with the sentence: "There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge." IV.A.2.h.clarifies that the 1.0 TUc "limit" serves as a trigger for initiation of a toxicity reduction evaluation (TRE)/toxicity investigation evaluation (TIE) process. These requirements were added to the permit to amend the previous numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations so that the Order would be consistent with State Board WQO 2003-012. (See Order R4-2004-0121). As currently worded in the Tentative Order, the numeric limit in Section IV.A.2.h.b is problematic because it represents an enforceable limit that, if exceeded, can result in other enforcement measures like MMPs in addition to accelerated monitoring. **Request:** As the reopener conditions in Resolution R4-2004-021 have not been met, we request that said Resolution be sustained by removing the numeric limit for chronic toxicity and replacing it with the narrative no-chronic-toxicity language in the aforesaid resolution. In addition, remove all references to the numeric limit in the Fact Sheet.				
Fecal coliform-receiving water	61	(#12, Section V.A.5) **Comment:** The receiving water limitation for fecal		X	Please refer to response #5	None necessary

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
limit		coliform in Section V.A.5.b.i and ii states that "[t]he fecal coliform concentration in the receiving water shall not exceed the following, as a result of wastes discharged… [for Single Sample Limits]: E-coli density shall not exceed 235/100 ml [and] Fecal coliform density shall not exceed 400/100 ml." Although the Regional Board may recognize that causal element for establishing a violation of Section V.A.5.b.i cannot be established where there has been no violation of the disinfection requirement, the receiving water limit should have a statement to that effect. **Request**: Amend the receiving water limitation to clarify that exceedance of the limit cannot be established where the effluent has been adequately disinfected as required in Section IV.A.2.d (i.e. where no violation of the effluent disinfection requirement can be established.).				
Numbering	62	(#13, V.A.25.c or as applicable) **Comment:** The District appreciates the Regional Board's willingness to retain the number system for our receiving water monitoring stations. To reiterate our comment, monitoring locations R3, R4, and R5 should remain and no change to the monitoring site designations should occur. We agree with Regional			Please refer to response #29.	Numbering changed.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Board's staff's response to this comment that the sampling locations should reflect representative samples given the changing hydromorphology. For consideration by the Regional Board staff, see the request below. Regional Board Staff should be aware of the reality of the altered river flow varies the actual confluence / mixing zone and samples may need to be collected farther downstream than as described in the Tentative Order for each monitoring location. **Request:** Please retain the current monitoring station references R3, R4, and R5. In addition, add language acknowledging that sampling locations should reflect representative samples given the changing hydromorphology of the river, and therefore samples may need to be collected further downstream than 50 feet.				
100-year return storm	63	(#14, VI.A.2.c) **Comment**: Provisions VI.A.2.c provides that "[a]ll facilities used for collection, transport, treatment…shall be adequately protected …from a storm or flood having a reoccurrence interval of once in 100 years." The District has miles of sewer trunk lines that lie within the channel areas of both the San Antonio Creek and Ventura River. The City of Ojai,		X	Please refer to response #6.	Text updated per wording agreed during June 11th meeting.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		and unincorporated communities of Meiners Oaks, Mira Monte, and Oak View have sewers that flow within these channels. The environmental community would not allow the District to build 100 year flood protection in these sensitive areas. Given these expressed considerations, the Regional Board has agreed to make changes to this requirement in response to our June 11 meeting, which we appreciate. Our recommended changes to Provision VI.A.2.c are shown below. **Request**: Revise Provision VI.A.2.c as follows: "All facilities used for the treatment of "wastes" shall be adequately protected against damage resulting from overflow, washout, or inundation from a storm or flood having a recurrence interval of once in 100 years. All facilities used for collection and transport of "wastes" to the Waste Water Treatment Plant shall be reasonably protected against damage resulting from overflow, washout, or inundation. "				
Spill Clean-up Contingency Plan	64	(#15, Section VI.C.3.b) **Comment**: The Spill Clean-up Contingency Plan appears to be redundant of requirements contained in		X	As par of the annual report, the Dischargers are required to explain the status of ongoing projects and activities. A section could be added to their regular annual report	None necessary

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		the Statewide General WDR for Sanitary System Overflows (SWRCB Order No. 2006-0003) associate with SSMPs. Although this General WDR is not intended to supersede more specific or stringent regional WDRs, this provision appears to be adequately covered by the General WDRs. As such, it adds an unnecessary and confusing layer of regulatory compliance. If the Regional Board wishes to supersede any of the General Order's requirements it should simply reference the requirements in the General WDR and specifically delineate any additional requirements that are not covered in said the general order. In addition, the Tentative Order should refer to the Plan name as the SSMP submitted under the General Order, and, if needed, simply state that the SSMP required by the State shall include such-and-such specific items that are not covered by the general order. **Request**: Please amend Provision VI.C.3.b in accordance with the above comment.			explaining the status of developing or updating their Spill Contingency Plan (SCP). In addition, as stated in Section VI.6 of the Tentative Order, "[t]he requirements contained in this Order in Sections VI.C.3.b. (Spill Contingency Plan Section), VI.C.4. (Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications Section), and VI.C.6. (Spill Reporting Requirements) are intended to be consistent with the requirements of the Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) WDR. The Regional Water Board recognizes that there may be some overlap between the NPDES permit provisions and SSOs WDR requirements. The requirements of the SSOs WDR are considered the minimum thresholds (see Finding 11 of WQ Order No. 2006-0003). The Regional Water Board will accept the documentation prepared by the Permittees under the SSOs WDR for compliance purposes, as satisfying the requirements in Sections VI.C.3.b., VI.C.4., and VI.C.6. provided any more specific or stringent provisions	

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					enumerated in this Order, have also been addressed." Therefore, the Discharger should submit a SCP, which a POTW should have in place as a emergency response plan. If the SCP is revised in the future, per SSO General WDR, a revised copy should be submitted to this Board.	
Flow Schematic	65	(#16, Attachment C Flow Schem.) **Comment**: The schematic in Attachment C is of Solids Process Flow and <u>not</u> the Liquid Process Flow **Request**: The schematic should be titled "Solids Process Flow Schematic…"	X		Please refer to response #7.	Schematic replaced.
Typo	66	(#17, Attachment D) **Comment**: The footer for Attachment D incorrectly says "Attachment C" **Request**: Please correct the above noted mistake. \	X		Typo corrected.	Typo corrected.
Word choice	67	(#18, Attachment D Section I.G.5.b) **Comment**: This section (Attachment D Section I.G.5.b) requires the District to "submit notice of an unanticipated bypass…" We would prefer you use the word "report" in lieu of "submit notice of."	X		Agreed.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Request: Please amend Standard Provision I.G.5.b per the above comment.				
Monitoring frequency	68	(#19, Attachment E, Section I.A.) **Comment:** The District thanks Regional Board staff for agreeing to retain the current quarterly, semiannual, and annual sampling schedules and eliminating the schedules reflected in the Tentative Order as reflected in the meeting notes provided to us by Cathy Chang. **Request:** Retain the current quarterly, semiannual, and annual sampling schedules as they appear in the current NPDES permit.	X		Please refer to response #9.	Text revised.
Reporting Schedule	69	(#20, Attachment E, Section I.A.) **Comment:** The District typically does not receive results from the multiple analytical laboratories for quarterly, semiannual and annual analyses for at least 45 days after samples are submitted to each laboratory. **Request**: The District requests that the due date for monthly monitoring report submittals be changed from the 1st month following the analysis to the 2nd month following the analysis so that all analytical results for quarterly, semiannual and annual testing can be included in the submittal.	X		Agreed.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
ELAP certification submittal	70	(#21, Attachment E Section I.B) **Comment:** In addition to the OVSD laboratory, several other laboratories perform testing on samples submitted by OVSD. Laboratories are not allowed to perform CWA testing without keeping ELAP certification current. Requiring the District to keep track of each laboratory's re-certification schedule and submit renewed ELAP certificates each time the laboratory is recertified is unnecessary and onerous. Section I.B is also unclear about who shall provide the laboratory certification and to whom it shall be provided each time a new certification is obtained from ELAP. **Request:** Remove the requirement for the District to submit ELAP certificates for all laboratories performing analyses for the District. Replace this requirement with the requirement to make these certificates available upon request.		X	This is a standard requirement in NPDES permit for POTWs and will remain. If the Discharger finds it challenging to keep track of each laboratory's re-certification schedule, perhaps one way is to add this requirement to the lab contract so that the lab would submit in a timely manner their Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP) recertification documentation.	None necessary
Typo	71	**(#22,** Attachment E Section I.K.) **Comment:** The use of "etc." in specifying types of permit limitations is vague. **Request:** Remove "etc." from this paragraph.	X		Agreed.	Text revised.
Cyanide monitoring	72	(#23, Attachment E Section III.A.1., Table 2) **Comment:** For influent priority pollutants, cyanide	X		Agreed.	Text revised.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		is missing from the list of priority pollutants that should be collected as grab samples. **Request**: In addition to VOCs and chromium VI, include cyanide in the analytes that are to be collected as grab samples.				
Typo	73	(#24, Attachment E Section IV.A.1., Table 3) **Comment 1:** Although footnote 7 applies to total coliform, total coliform is not footnoted. **Comment 2:** Footnote 6 requires that the District report the "minimum daily peak" and "average daily" for chlorine residual. "Minimum" and "peak" are contradictory. **Comment 3:** The abbreviation used for milligrams per liter is not consistent. **Request**: Add footnote 7 to total coliform in Table 3. Revise footnote 6 to specify "minimum daily and average daily values." Change instances of "mg/l" to "mg/L."	X		Agreed.	Text revised.
Increased monitoring	74	(#25, Attachment E Section IV.A) **Comment:** Section VI.B in Attachment F states that monitoring requirements are largely unchanged from the previous order and notes that monitoring frequency has been reduced for pollutants that no		X	The reference to a reduction in monitoring frequency due to lack of RP is deleted because given that many of those constituent are priority pollutants which need to be monitored on a semi-annual	Deleted reference to monitoring reduction.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		longer have effluent limits. Attachment F, however, fails to explain why effluent sampling frequencies have increased for: sulfate, chloride, and boron increased (from annual to quarterly), TDS (from semiannual to quarterly). In addition, total hardness testing is a new requirement. The increased testing for these constituents will unnecessarily increase our monitoring program costs. A review of the District's historical monitoring >30 years of data for these constituents will demonstrate they have little variation, which was the basis for the reduced monitoring frequency previously provided. **Request**: Please conform to Attachment F's statements and retain the current monitoring frequencies for salts constituents. If the Regional Board will not agree to this request, please explain the rationale for the increased monitoring frequencies.			basis, the statement is, for the most part, inaccurate. For reasons for increased monitoring, please refer to response #32.	
Notation for Chemicals	75	**(#26,** Attachment E, Section IV.A.1., Table 3) **Comment 1: "**Total Phosphorus" and "Phosphorus as P" signify the same constituent. **Comment 2:** Units for picocuries per liter are incorrect. "Pico" is represented by a lower-case "p". **Comment 3:** Footnote 9 contains a stray right parenthesis.	X		Typo corrected. Typo corrected. Typo corrected. The criteria come from drinking water	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Comment 4: Footnote 10 refers to "stipulated criteria" for radium 226 and 228 that trigger analysis of tritium, strontium-90 and uranium. It is unclear what these criteria are. **Request:** Change "Phosphorus as P" to "Orthophosphate as P". Change radioactivity units from "PCi/L" to "pCi/L" and remove the stray right parenthesis from footnote 9. Specify what the "stipulated criteria" are for Radium 226 and Radium 228.			standards. If gross alpha >15 pCi/L or gross beta> 50 pCi/L, then the Discharger must analyze for Radium 226 and Radium 228 to see if these constituents account for the exceedance in gross alpha and gross beta. Radium 226 and Radium 228 occur widely in nature and usually account for the high alpha and beta. And, if the combined Radium - 226+228 exceeds 5 pCi/L, then the Discharger must analyze for tritium, strontium, and uranium to evaluate if manmade isotopes or uranium is causing the high alpha and beta.	
Total hardness	76	**(#27,** Attachment E, Section IV.A) **Comment**: The monthly monitoring of total hardness is new. We question the need for monthly monitoring and believe quarterly monitoring would be sufficient. **Request**: Decrease the monitoring frequency for total hardness from monthly to quarterly.		X	For the reason for requiring total hardness monitoring, please refer to response #32. We believe that monthly monitoring would provide the necessary data to better characterize the hardness of the water, and this frequency is consistent with the requirement in other POTW NPDES permit in the region.	None necessary
Emerging chemicals, endocrine disrupting	77	**(#28,** Attachment E Section IV.A, Table 3) **Comment**: Regarding the monitoring requirements for emerging chemicals, endocrine disrupting compounds, and pharmaceuticals, we adopt by		X	To be consistent with NPDES permits recently adopted for other POTWs in this region, footnotes 12, 13, and 14 have been revised to read,:	Footnotes revised.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
compounds, and pharmaceuticals		reference the comment submitted by the City of Camarillo on behalf of the District in a letter dated June 9, 2008. **Request**: Please amend the language in footnotes 13 and 14 as follows: "These chemicals need to be monitored only when the USEPA-approved analytical methods for these chemicals are available and USEPA has promulgated the methods for incorporation into 40 CFR Part 136." Note that this requested wording differs slightly from Camarillo's suggested wording.			Footnote 12- Emerging chemicals include 1,4-dioxane (USEPA 8270c test method), perchlorate (USEPA 314 test method), 1,2,3-trichloropropane (USEPA 504.1 or 8260B test method), and methyl tert-butyl ether (USEPA 8260B test method). These chemicals need to be monitored in August. Footnote 13- Endocrine disrupting chemicals include ethinyl estradiol, 17-B estradiol, estrone, bisphenol A, nonylhenol and nonylphenol polyethoxylate, octylphenol and octylphenol polyethoxylate, and polybrominated diphenyl ethers. These chemicals need to be monitored, only when the USEPA-approved analytical methods for these chemicals are available. These chemicals need to be monitored during August. Footnote 14- Pharmaceuticals include acetaminophen, amoxicillin, azithromycin, caffeine, carbamazepine, ciprofloxacin, ethylenediamine tetra-acetic acid (EDTA), gemfibrozil, ibuprofen, iodinated contrast media, lipitor, methadone, morphine,	

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					salicylic acid, and triclosan. These chemicals need to be monitored, only when the USEPA- approved analytical methods for these chemicals are available. These chemicals need to be monitored during August.	
Typo	78	**(#29,** Attachment E Section IV.A, Table 3, footnote 12) **Comment:** Footnote 12 calls for using USEPA method 9260B for testing methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE). There is no method 9260b. It should read 8260B. We appreciate Regional Board staff's agreement to make this revision as reflected in Cathy Chang's June 11 meeting notes. **Request**: Please correct the test method reference for MTBE to EPA Method 8260B.	X		Agreed.	Text revised.
Non-chlorinated phenols	79	**(#30,** Attachment E Section IV.A.1., Table 3) **Comment:** The requirement to analyze non-chlorinated phenols as grab samples is inappropriate in that it is not a standard requirement in other NPDES permits in Region 4 for similar treatment facilities. Regional Board staff has produced no evidence that analyzing this constituent as a grab	X		Agreed.	Text deleted.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		sample produces superior results. **Request:** To be consistent with other NPDES permits in Region 4, change delete the two rows for chlorinated and non-chlorinated phenols from Table 3. These will then be included in the semiannual priority pollutant category.				
Perchlorate, 1,4-dioxane, and 1,2,3-trichloropropane	80	**(#31,** Attachment E Section IV.A.1., Table 3) **Comment:** Perchlorate, 1,4-dioxane, and 1,2,3-trichloropropane are already included in Table 3 in individual rows, so this requirement is duplicative. MTBE is the only constituent that is not listed in Table 3. Request: Either remove the individual rows for perchlorate, 1,4-dioxane and 1,2,3-trichloropropane in Table 3, or replace "Emerging Contaminants" with "MTBE".	X		Agreed. Individual rows for perchlorate, 1,4-dioxane and 1,2,3-trichloropropane in Table 3 removed.	Text deleted.
Typo	81	**(#32,** Attachment E Section 5.A.2.b.) **Comment:** "Silverslide" is misspelled and should be revised to "silverside". **Request:** Correct the spelling of "silverslide".	X		Agreed.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Typo	82	**(#33,** Attachment E Section 5.A.2.d.) **Comment:** References to the acute toxicity requirements "IV.A.4.g.a.(i) and (ii)" and "V.A.17.c" are incorrect. **Request:** Replace "4" with "2", and replace "17" with "25".	X		Agreed.	Text revised.
Reporting frequency	83	**(#34,** Attachment E Section V.G.1.) **Comment**: This section states that the "The full report shall be received…by the 15th day of the "third" month following sampling." Currently the full report is due on the "second" month. **Request**: Please revise the language so the full report will be due by the 15th day of the second month following sampling.	X		Please refer to response #16.	Text revised.
Summary table of toxicity data	84	**(#35,** Attachment E Section V.G.4) **Comment**: – This section requires the District to provide a summary table of toxicity data from at least eleven of the most recent samples. This requirement is appropriate only for problem agencies that have recurrent toxicity exceedances. Because the District is not a problem agency in regard to toxicity, the language should only require the summary table if a		X	Please refer to response #26. In addition, this requirement is consistent with the requirement in NPDES recently adopted for other POTWs in this region.	None necessary.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		toxicity discharge problems exists. **Request**: Revise the language in Section V.G.4 to require the summary table only under specified criteria indicating a toxicity problem.				
Total flow unit	85	**(#36,** Attachment E Section Attachment E Section VII.A.1) **Comment**: Table 4a provides units of total flow in CFS. This should state MGD instead of CFS. In addition, footnote 15 in Table 4a requires the District to report daily flow and average daily flow. We perform this measurement at a point in time during the day, across a cross-section of the river. Footnote 15 should be amended to reflect our current practices. **Request**: Please amend Table 4a and footnote 15 per the above comment.	X		Agreed. Deleted footnote #15, and changed unit from cubic feet per second (CFS) to MGD.	Text revised.
Typo	86	**(#37,** Attachment E Section VII.A.1, Table 4a) **Comment:** The footnote reference listed in the "Required Analytical Test Method" column is incorrect from turbidity through fecal coliform on page E-16 and for all constituents listed on page E-17..	X		Please refer to response #36.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Request: Change the footnote reference in the "Required Analytical Test Method" column from "13" to "16" for turbidity through fecal coliform on page E-16 and for all constituents listed on page E-17.				
	87	**(#38,** Attachment E Section VII.A, Table 4a) **Comment:** The receiving water monitoring requirements have increased for several constituents including: • For TDS, Sulfate, Chloride, 2,3,7,8 TCDD, and all other Priority pollutants, the frequencies have increased from annual to semiannual. • Monitoring of priority pollutants is now required for <u>all</u> stations where they were only required for R3/R1 and R3/R5 before. • Semiannual boron monitoring has been added. • Monitoring frequency for MBAS and CTAS has been increased from semiannual to quarterly. The District appreciates the Regional Board's agreement to change monitoring frequency of MBAS and CTAS to semiannual, as well as quarterly sampling from semi-annual for nitrate-N. However,		X	Please refer to response #35.	None necessary, except MBAS and CTAS have been changed to semiannual .

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		the increase receiving water monitoring frequencies for the other constituents cited above will result in substantial additional program costs, which the District does not believe is necessary. **Request:** Please retain the current monitoring frequencies as discussed above.				
chlorpyrifos and diazinon monitoring	88	**(#39,** Attachment E Section VII.A, Table 4a **)** **Comment:** We appreciate Regional Board's staff's agreement to remove the monitoring requirement for chlorpyrifos and diazinon. To reiterate our comment expressed at our June 11 meeting, monitoring requirements for chlorpyrifos and diazinon were dropped from the District's current permit because these constituent were not detected in our effluent for a two year period. The Tentative Order requires semiannual monitoring of these constituents. We are not aware that these constituents show detection in the ROWD submitted to the Regional Board. Therefore, we do not believe it is necessary to sample for these constituents. **Request:** Please remove the monitoring requirement for chlorpyrifos and diazinon.	X		Please refer to response #33.	Change has been made.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Typo	89	(#40, Attachment E Section VII A.1., Table 4a) **Comment:** The footnote associated with the turbidity requirement (footnote 17) is applicable to effluent and was inappropriately applied to receiving water, where turbidity monitoring is not continuous but is performed with a grab sample. **Request:** Remove footnote 17 from turbidity in Table 4a, and revise subsequent footnote numbers accordingly.	X		Agreed.	Footnote deleted or revised.
Monitoring frequency for Nitrate-N & Typo	90	**(#41,** VII A.1., Table 4a) **Comment 1:** The monitoring frequency for Nitrate-N is indicated as semiannual, when it must be required quarterly with other nitrogen species to calculate total nitrogen. **Comment 2:** "Phosphate-P" should be revised to be consistent with the constituent name used for effluent monitoring ("Orthophospate-P"). **Request:** Revise the monitoring frequency for Nitrate-N from semiannually to quarterly. Revise "Phosphate-P" to "Orthophosphate-P" to for consistency in constituent names.	X		Please refer to response #35 on nitrate-N. "Phosphate-P" has been revised to Orthophospate-P.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
2,3,7,8 TCDD	91	**(#42,** Attachment E Section VII.A, Table 3 and 4a) **Comment:** The current permit requires testing for the 17 dioxin congeners in the effluent until 2005. Given that Table R1 correctly concludes that no limit for dioxin is necessary because there was no reasonable potential based on 2003-2007 monitoring data, we question why monitoring for the congeners in the receiving water is required. Table 4a footnote 20 states that the monitoring is required "in accordance with the SIP." We fail to understand this reading of the SIP. Section 3 of the SIP (p. 29) clarifies that Regional Boards shall require effluent monitoring for 2,3,7,8 TCDD whether the POTW has an effluent limit for the pollutant. However, this requirement is clarified in the text that follows on page 29 of the SIP. In particular, per the SIP, the Regional Board is supposed to "determine whether further monitoring is necessary" at the conclusion of the three-year monitoring period required pursuant to Section 3 of the SIP and our current permit (which ended in 2005). Since the monitoring results from that three-year period do not confirm reasonable potential as reflected in Table R1, we do not understand how the Board can determine that further monitoring of the 17 dioxin congeners is necessary even in the receiving water. In addition, the monitoring would cost about $1,700 per sample,			Similar to other priority pollutants, semi-annual monitoring for this pollutant is necessary to collect necessary data to perform RPA for the next permit cycle.	

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		which translates to $11,000 per year with the additional and accelerated river monitoring. We regard these increased costs as unreasonable. Request: Please adhere to the intent behind Section 3 of the SIP by (1) removing 2,3,7,8-TCDD from Table 4a and (2) removing footnote 20 from Table 4a.				
Typo	92	**(#43,** VII A.1., Table 4a) **Comment 1:** The footnote reference for footnote 19 is missing from "Diazinon", as footnote applies to chlorpyrifos and diazinon. **Comment 2:** Priority pollutants are listed as a 24-hour composite when receiving water analyses are performed on grab samples. **Comment 3:** The annual requirement for NDMA is duplicative in that NDMA is one of the priority pollutants and is already required semiannually **Request:** Add footnote reference 19 to "Diazinon". In the Sample Type column for priority pollutants, replace "24-hour composite; grab for VOCs[11]" with "grab". Remove the requirement to analyze NDMA annually, as it is included in the list of priority pollutants required on a semiannual frequency.	X		Agreed. Also refer to response #33.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Typo	93	**(#44,** Attachment E Section VII.A, Table 4a **)** **Comment:** Footnote 19 is cutoff mid sentence. References to footnote 13 should be footnote 16. Per our June 11 meeting, the Regional Board has agreed to correct these minor errors. **Request:** Please complete the sentence in footnote 19 and change reference to footnote 13 to 16.	X		Please refer to responses #19 and #36.	Text revised.
	94	**(#45,** Attachment E Section VII.A, Table 4a **)** **Comment:** We acknowledge the changes to footnote 19 on page E-17 that resulted from our June 11, 2008 meeting. However, the District maintains that there are still several substantive issues surrounding a requirement for quarterly monitoring for chlorophyll-a in benthic algae. In the context of this NPDES permit, a requirement for quarterly sampling of benthic algal biomass (as chlorophyll-a per unit area or ash-free dry weight per unit area) is inappropriate for the following reasons: 1. Legitimate estimates of benthic algal biomass in a stream reach can only be obtained by establishing a series of transects which intersect examples of all stream habitat types present in the reach (riffles, runs,			Please refer to response #122. The monitoring frequency has been reduced to annual, and the monitoring of algal biomass shall coincide with pH, dissolved oxygen, and bioassessment monitoring. The Ventura River is 303(d)-listed for algae, which makes algal biomass monitoring all the more critical and time-sensitive. Therefore, the requested delay in monitoring will not be granted.	Text revised.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		and pools), with multiple samples taken at each transect across the wetted width of the stream channel. Owing to high inherent spatial variation in substrate characteristics, flow rates, and other habitat variables, considerable expertise and professional judgement are required to ensure that sampling design will result in scientifically meaningful results at a given site. Less training and expertise is required to estimate percent cover in the field. However, to be quantitative, percent cover must be obtained using point-intersect techniques (transects or grids) at multiple positions along several transects (as opposed to non-objective visual estimates). Both of these approaches (quantitative estimation of chlorophyll-a or percent cover) are substantially different, substantially more time consuming, and require substantially more expertise than the collection of grab samples of water for shipment to commercial laboratories. **Request**: Delete the requirement for quarterly measurement of chlorophyll-a per unit area. 2. At the receiving water sites for OVSD, benthic algae colonizes a variety of substrates, which includes bedrock, boulders, large and medium				

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		cobbles, gravel, sand, silt, clay, aquatic plants, and concrete. Each of the substrates requires a different approach (and different tools) for quantitative removal of attached algae for chlorophyll-a (or ash-free dry weight) analysis. The tools used in well-regarded benthic algae sampling programs in southern California are not those described in the EPA's Rapid Bioassessment Protocol for periphyton and are not commercially available, but are constructed by hand by those who work in the field and are familiar with the substrates and taxa present in southern California streams. **Request:** Delay any requirement for algal biomass monitoring until such time as the State has adopted a *peer-reviewed*, *field-callibrated* methodology that utilizes the best-available approaches for removing algal tissue from the range of substrates colonized by benthic algae in the Ventura River. 3. Once benthic algal tissue is removed from stream substrates using one tool or another, the algal sample is subjected to a series of processing steps (which may take place wholly or partially in the lab) that ultimately result in pigment extracts. These are steps (1) for which there are currently no State adopted				

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		standard methods, (2) which are not performed at commercial laboratories which measure chlorophyll-a in water samples, (3) which are still being refined - primarily in academic settings, and (4) which need to be adjusted depending on which substrates were sampled and which taxa of algae were present in the field at the time of sampling. The steps are unique to benthic algae sampling, and are not the same as the simple steps required to obtain pigment extracts from phytoplankton samples. OVSD recognizes that the EPA outlines a procedure for sampling for chlorophyll-a in its Rapid Bioassessment Prototcol for stream periphyton. New information from a Special Study on potential algal impairments in the Calleguas Creek Watershed (which will be submitted to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board in July, 2008) shows that the sample processing approach in the EPA protocol *likely cause underestimation of chlorophyll-a on the order of 30%*. The flawed steps involve the dislodging of algal tissue from tools or substrates, suspension of algal tissue in water, homogenization, and subsampling onto filters. The Regional Board has indicated that the State, through SWAMP, will be publishing a SOP for chlorophyll-a in stream periphyton sometime this year. It is highly likely that SWAMP will be adopting aspects of the EPA's				

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Rapid Bioassessment Protocol for stream periphyton that are related to measurement of chlorophyll-a. If so, the SWAMP protocol will be flawed, because the EPA protocol includes the sample processing steps referred to above that can lead to a serious underestimation of the chlorophyll-a content of algal tissue. **Request**: Delay any requirement for monitoring for chlorophyll-a (or ash free dry weight) per unit area until such time as the State has a *peer reviewed* protocol for processing field samples of stream algae for analysis of chlorophyll-a or ash-free dry weight that does not suffer from the methodological flaws referenced above, *and that has been subjected to independent laboratory callibration.* 4. Even if the methodological problems associated with field sampling and sample processing were sufficiently addresssed by a State protocol, there would be additional difficulties in carrying out the final steps of chlorophyll-a measurement. After field collection, and preparation of pigment extracts, additional expertise is required in a laboratory setting to correctly perform serial dilutions of pigment extracts prior to fluorometric or spectrophotometric				

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		analysis - expertise which is not reliably available at commercial laboratories. To OVSD's knowledge, there is currently only one laboratory in the State (Los Angeles County Sanitation District) certified to analyze chlorophyll-a in pigment extracts, and this laboratory is not a commercial laboratory. **Request**: Delay any requirement for monitoring chlorophyll-a per unit area until such time as there are adequate commercial facilities certified for the spectrophotometric or fluorometric analysis of chlorophyll-a in pigment extracts. 5. Given the problematic status of the field and laboratory procedures currently described in the EPA's protocol for chlorophyll-a sampling, and the lack of a peer reviewed, field- and laboratory-callibrated State protocol at this time, OVSD requests that a more direct, and less problematic, approach be permitted for monitoring potential algal impairment at the receiving water sites, *in lieu of measurement of chlorophyll-a or ash-free dry weight*. The principal potential impairment of aquatic life beneficial uses that is associated with nuisance growths of benthic algae is the depression of dissolved oxygen (especially at night) below the threshold minimum				

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		established in the Basin Plan. OVSD proposes to carry out diel (24-h) measurements of dissolved oxygen (for one or more days) in receiving water sites on a quarterly basis, *instead of monitoring chlorophyll-a per unit area*. As a reasonable compromise, quantitative estimates of percent cover of nuisance categories of algae could be paired with the quarterly diel monitoring for dissolved oxygen. **Request**: Substitute any requirement for monitoring for chlorophyll-a per unit area with diel measurements of dissolved oxygen in the receiving water.				
Typo	95	**(#46,** VII A.1., Tables 4b, 4c and 4d) **Comment:** The footnote listed in the "Required Analytical Test Method" column is incorrect. The correct footnote reference is footnote 16. **Request:** For Tables 4b, 4c and 4d, replace the reference to footnote 13 in the "Required Analytical Test Method" column to "16".	X		Agreed.	Text revised.
Typo	96	**(#47,** VII A.1., Table 4d) **Comment:** The majority of metals listed in Table 4d are already included in Table 4a in the semiannual	X		Please refer to response #37.	Text revised.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		priority pollutant monitoring requirement. The metals that are not included in the semiannual priority pollutant monitoring requirement include aluminum, cobalt, iron, molybdenum and vanadium. **Request:** Because priority pollutant metals are already included in Table 4a under the semiannual priority pollutant requirement, delete from Table 4d all metals except aluminum, cobalt, iron, molybdenum and vanadium.				
Tidal and sand bar observation	97	**(#48,** VII.A.5.g and j) **Comment:** The reference to "tide" in item g. and the requirement in item j are no longer applicable as the District is no longer required to collect samples in the estuary. **Request:** Remove the reference to "tide" from item g and remove item j as these are no longer applicable to the OVSD monitoring program.	X		Please refer to response #38.	Specific monitoring requirements removed.
Typo	98	**(#49,** VIII.A.1 and VIII.A.2) **Comment 1:** "Division" in "Ventura County Watershed Protection Division" is incorrect. **Comment 2:** "Ventura County Flood Control District" is now the "Ventura County Watershed	X		Please refer to response #39.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Protection District". **Request:** The name of the County agency in both instances should be revised to "Ventura County Watershed Protection District", as acknowledged in Ms. Chang's meeting notes.				
Tertiary bypass-oil and grease monitoring & reporting to the Regional Board	99	**(#50,** Attachment E Section VIII.B.1 and B.4) **Comment 1:** Section VIII.B.1 requires the District to monitor for oil and grease on a daily basis during any day the filters are bypassed. We do not understand the need for this new monitoring requirement and believe it will add an unnecessary burden on the District. **Request**: Delete "oil and grease" from Section VIII.B.1.	X		Please refer to response #14.	
Tertiary bypass-oil and grease monitoring & reporting to the Regional Board	99	**(#50,** Attachment E Section VIII.B.1 and B.4) **Comment 2:** The last sentence of Section VIII.B.4 provides that results from the daily effluent monitoring shall be submitted to the Regional Board as they become available. We would prefer this reporting requirement be similar to the reporting requirements for noncompliance that endangers health or the environment as described in Attachment			Please refer to response #15.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		D, Section V.E. Such reporting would be more appropriate and efficient for Regional Board staff. As currently written in Section VIII.B.4, the reporting procedure would seem to have little benefit while adding unnecessary requirements. **Request**: In addition, use a 24-hr reporting procedure like that reflected in Attachment D Section V.E for effluent monitoring during filter treatment system bypasses.				
Typo	100	**(#51,** Attachment E Section IX.A.5) **Comment**: RSW-002 appears to have been inadvertently written twice. **Request**: Please correct the above noted error.	X		This subsection has been removed because it is more appropriate for a case where a waterbody has been 303(d)-listed for ammonia.	Text deleted.
Reporting schedule	101	**(#52,** Attachment E Section IX.B.3, Table 5) **Comment 1**: The semiannual monitoring period begins on the closest of January 1 or July 1 following or on the permit effective date. The reporting period for semiannual monitoring should be consistent with the quarterly monitoring period and changed to the closest of February 1 or August 1 following or on the permit effective date **Comment 2**: The SMR due date under the monthly	X		Please see response #16.	Text revised

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		row should read "second" month instead of "third " month **Request**: Please revise Table 5 per the above comments.				
Monitoring frequency	102	**(#53,** Attachment E Section IX.B, Table 5) **Comment:** For quarterly sampling in Table 5, is the monitoring period construed to mean that there is no October quarterly SMR required in 2008 since this will be before Nov 1? **Request:** This comment was clarified at RWQCB meeting with agreement to keep existing quarterly schedule.	X		Please refer to responses #8 and 40.	Monitoring and reporting frequency revised.
	103	**(#54, Attachment E Section** IX.B.4) **Comment:** The requirement to report the MDL and values between the MDL and ML as "estimated" and "DNQ" are from the SIP and apply only to effluent and receiving water data, and not influent data. This should be specified in this permit requirement. **Request:** Specify that reporting the MDL, ML and DNQ or "estimated" results applies only to effluent and receiving water data, but not to influent data, to be consistent with the SIP.			The SIP is silent with respect to influent data and method detection level (MDL). Regional Board staff needs to know the MDL, minimum level (ML), and detected but not quantified (DNQ) values of both influent and effluent, in order calculate percent removal- i.e. how much of the pollutant is removed by the plant's treatment system. Also, this info will help the POTWs when they have to perform local limits analysis under the pretreatment program.	None necessary.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					If the Discharger does not use a method with a low enough detection limit in the influent, as well as in the effluent, it might seem as though the Discharger is generating a pollutant. For example, a POTW can have a <50 µg/L value in the influent and 2 µg/L in the effluent. When they compare values it would seem that the plant is producing the pollutant rather than removing it.	
	104	**(#55,** Attachment E Section IX.D.1 & D.3) **Comment**: We question whether a "Reasonable Potential Analysis" section of each annual monitoring report is necessary. We fail to understand what purpose this annual task would serve and are unclear what base water quality data set would be used to perform the analysis. In Section D.3 we ask whether the technical report must cover the treatment plant only, or should it address both the treatment plant and collection system? **Request**: Please remove the "Reasonable Potential Analysis" requirement from Section IX.D.1. If the Regional Board cannot meet this request, please clarify why this requirement is necessary, and make the clarifications stated in the above comment. Additionally, please clarify the scope of the		X	Please refer to response #41.	

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		"technical report".				
Typo	105	**(#56,** Attachment F Section I, Table 1) **Comment**: Table 1 incorrectly states that the WWTP is located in Los Angeles County rather than Ventura County. Although John Correa is the authorized person as shown in Table 1, the District extends and delegates this authority to Ronald Sheets, Operations Superintendent. **Request**: Please correct our County location **Request:** Please add Ronald Sheets, Operations Superintendent as an authorized person to sign and submit reports.	X	X	Typo corrected regarding County location. The comment letter is not the appropriate medium to request this change. Please submit a formal letter from the authorized person (i.e. General Manager) requesting to add Ronald Sheets, Operations Superintendent as an authorized person to sign and submit reports.	Text revised for County location.
Clarification	106	**(#57,** Attachment F Section II) **Comment**: Please add Casitas Springs, Foster Park, and the North Ventura Avenue area to the list of communities served by the Ojai Valley WWTP. **Request**: Please make the above requested additions.	X		Casitas Springs and Foster Park already appear in the Tentative Permit. Reference to the North Ventura Avenue area has been added.	Text inserted.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Clarification	107	**(#58,** Attachment F Section II.A.4) **Comment**: In the description under "Grit removal and screening:" please revise the second sentence to: "Grit is removed by settling. Rags and plastic are removed by screening. This material is collected and disposed of to a landfill." This is a more accurate description of the District's treatment process. **Request**: Please make the above requested wording changes.	X		Please refer to response #19.	Text revised.
Clarification	108	**(#59,** Attachment F, Section II.B) **Comment**: Please add "Ojai Valley Sanitary District" to the list of agencies involved with the development of the Ventura River Steelhead Restoration and Recovery Plan. Also, change "Flood Control" to "Watershed Protection." **Request**: Please make the above requested wording changes.	X		Text appropriately changed.	Text revised.
MEC	109	**(#60,** Attachment F Section II.C, Table 2) **Comment**: The District appreciates the Regional				MEC values have been revised for iron, oil and

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Board's staff's agreement to correct all mistakes in Table 2 of the Fact Sheet as reflected in Cathy Chang's June 11 meeting notes. We reiterate our comments here:				grease, selenium and Bis (2-ethylhexyl phthalate
		• Table 2 lists the highest daily discharge for Oil and Grease to be 3.0. This is incorrect. It should be ND. The data summary submitted to the regional board had one sample in 2003 listed as "<3." This must have been seen as a 3.	X		Agreed, and the MEC for iron has been noted as ND.	
		• Iron is listed in the table twice. One needs to be removed. Iron is reported in mg/l not ug/l and the highest daily discharge should be 0.14 not 0.7.		X	For iron, please refer to response #20.	
		• The high for selenium should be 3.0 not 3.9. These were typos in the data summary sent.	X		Agreed. The MEC has been changed to 3.0.	
		• Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate high should be 8.9 not 24. The 24 is from a composite test which is not valid as we are required to report grabs.	X		Agreed. The MEC has been changed to 8.9.	
		Request: Please correct the data values as requested above. As agreed previously, the District will provide the Regional Board staff with the original lab				

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		sheets to document the highest value for selenium.				
Effluent limit for cyanide & double entry for iron	110	**(#61,** Attachment F, Section II.C, Table 2) **Comment**: Table 2 shows the average monthly effluent limit for cyanide on our current permit as 3.4 ug/L. This limitation was to have been recalculated as an error was found. The corrected value should be 4 mg/L. In addition, the row on the bottom of the table for iron should be deleted. **Request**: Please make the above requested changes.		X	The 2003 Permit contains 3.4 ug/L for cyanide. If there was subsequent Regional Board action, which made changes to the cyanide limit, please either submit a copy of the Board action or we ask that the Discharger provide us with a proper reference to the document that substantiates the request for change. For iron, please refer to response #20.	Entry for iron changed per response # 20. Cyanide 2003 limit remains unchanged.
TSO- nitrate and nitrite	111	**(#62,** Attachment F Section II.D.1) **Comment**: Item #1 in Section II.D is not part of the TSO No. R4-2003-0088. **Request**: Please delete item #1 in Section II.D of the Fact Sheet.	X		Please refer to response #21.	Text revised.
Typo	112	**(#63,** Attachment F, Section IV.C.2.b.iii) **Comment**: This section refers to "Order R4-2002-0142." This should be "Order R4-2003-0087." **Request**: Please correct the above error.	X		Typo corrected.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Typo	113	**(#64,** Attachment F, Section IV.C.2.x(b) and xi) **Comment**: The effluent limit of 8 mg/L for total inorganic nitrogen is incorrect. The Basin Plan limit is 10 mg/L. In addition, the explanation of the 1 mg/L nitrate limit is incorrect because the limit was added to our previous permit. The implication in Section IV.C.2.xi by use of the words "has been added" is that the limit is new, which is incorrect. **Request**: Change the effluent TIN limit to 10 mg/L, and change "has been added" in subsection xi to read "was previously added" as it was identified in Order R4-2003-0087.	X		Agreed. Please refer to response #24.	Text revised.
Typo	114	**(#65,** Attachment F, Section IV.C.2.xii) **Comment**: As stated in Comment #7 above, the permit should have no effluent limit for ammonia because RP cannot be demonstrated for this constituent. However, if the ammonia limits are retained in the permit, all references to them should be consistent. The recitation of the AMEL for ammonia on pages F-23 and F-25 differ significantly from the limit shown on pages 15 and F-27. **Request**: Please remove the ammonia effluent limits due to the absence of RP. Otherwise, make the limits consistent throughout the permit.			Please refer to responses #3 and #56. The typo in the ammonia limit has been revised to reflect 3.0 for monthly average throughout the Tentative Order and Fact Sheet.	Text revised per responses #3 and #56.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
Typo	115	**(#66,** Attachment F, Section IV.C.xii **)** **Comment**: The last sentence at the end of page F-23 evidently has an extra "dependent," which should be removed. In addition, the words "on not" should be "not on." **Request**: See correct the above noted wording.	X		Typo corrected.	Text revised.
Temperature limit	116	**(#67,** Attachment F, Section IV.C.xiv **)** **Comment**: Because the 86 degrees temperature limit is a new and lower limit, we would like to get a copy of the white paper referenced in the last paragraph on page F-28 entitled *Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen Impacts on Biota in Tidal Estuaries and Enclosed Bays in the Los Angeles Region.* **Request**: Please provide the District with a copy of the above mentioned document, or inform us as soon as practicable regarding how to acquire one.	X		We will inquire into how to obtain a copy of the requested document and inform the Discharger.	None necessary.
Typo	117	**(#68,** Attachment F, Table 8) **Comment**: Table 8 has an error for chloride. The limit should be "300" mg/L , not "30" mg/L. In addition, the footnote reference on TSS and all constituent below TSS should be "4" not "9."	X		Typo has been corrected.	Text revised.

Response to Comments Received
Regarding the Tentative NPDES Orders
For
Ojai Valley Sanitary District

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		Request: Please make the above noted corrections.				
Typo	118	**(#69,** Attachment F Section V.B **)** **Comment**: The last sentence of the first paragraph states that groundwater from the Basin is used to provide drinking water to the community. This is not correct. The Lower Ventura River Groundwater Basin underlying the point of discharge is not used to provide drinking water to the community." Otherwise, the Regional Board would have removed the P* designation for the groundwater basin. In addition, the last sentence on page F-43 is unclear and appears to be either missing a word or has incorrect punctuation. Please clarify the sentence. **Request**: Please properly state that the groundwater basin is not used as a source of drinking water, and clarify the last sentence on page F-43.	X		The word "lower" has been deleted. The word "and" has been added to the last sentence on page F-43.	Text revised.
Comments Received on June 9th, 2008 from Camarillo Sanitary District Regarding the Tentative Dated May 19, 2008						
Emerging chemicals	119	The Dischargers believe that the Regional Board has not set forth the rationale for requiring monitoring of these constituents: "emerging chemicals" (1,4-dioxane, perchlorate, 1,2,3-trichloropropane, and methyl tert-butyl ether), (*i.e.,* why the Regional Board believes such monitoring is necessary).	X		Language was added to the Fact Sheet to explain why the Regional Board is requiring this monitoring.	Explained reason for monitoring
Endocrine	120	The Tentative states that the specified endocrine		X	It is important to know whether or not these	None

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
disruptors		disrupting chemicals and pharmaceuticals must be monitored "only when the analytical methods for these chemicals are applicable and approved by the California Department of Public Health…." The Dischargers understand that at this time, CDPH, among other entities, believes the imposition of individual monitoring requirements for these constituents is not appropriate, as the chemistry and analytical techniques simply do not exist to measure accurately, quantify. The Dischargers request that the effluent monitoring for specified emerging chemicals , endocrine disrupting chemicals, and pharmaceuticals be removed from the Tentative Monitoring and Reporting Program, and a watershed or basin-wide approach should be pursued, similar to the plan currently envisioned by the Santa Ana Regional Board. If monitoring data for informational purposes is sought by the Regional Board, this should be accomplished using a different regulatory vehicle that is not an enforceable NPDES Permit and associated monitoring and reporting program.			constituents are present in the effluent or not, and if so, at what concentrations. However, we are aware of the challenges associated with the currently available test methods. That is why we have modified the monitoring requirement to begin in August 2009, only if there is a USEPA-approved test method available, at that time. A watershed or basin-wide approach to monitoring may be sound approach. The Tentative Permit is revised so that the Discharger is required to submit a written proposal to the Regional Board within 90 days of the effective date of the Permit Until such written proposal is submitted and reviewed and approved by the Regional Board, the Discharger shall conduct the monitoring as required in the Permit.	necessary
Algal Biomass Monitoring	122	The quarterly sampling of algal biomass is inappropriate for several reasons, including the fact that each of the substrates requires a different approach and different tools, the legitimate approach for processing and estimating benthic algal biomass is complex, time-consuming, and require			The United States Environmental Protection Agency and the State of California recommend algal community analysis as a useful tool to help assess ambient water quality conditions in wadeable streams. Monitoring of the algal community is a	Text revised.

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
		substantially more expertise than collection of grab samples of water for shipment to commercial laboratories..			good complement to the benthic macroinvertebrate assessments that have been routinely conducted in wadeable streams for the past several years. This type of monitoring is being incorporated into the statewide Perennial Stream Assessment in 2008 conducted by the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP). SWAMP has developed a draft SOP for Algae and Physical Habitat Field Data Collection (prepared by the Southern California Coastal Water Research Project). This SOP addresses how to remove algae from various types of substrates and the sampling methodology to employ to collect a representative sample (multiple transects along a stream reach). A final SOP should be released by the end of June, 2008. Although it is true that the sampling equipment used is not commercially available, the devices are simple to construct from readily available materials. Since most of the sample processing occurs in the field, laboratory processing of the samples for chlorophyll a or biomass	

Subject	#	Comment	Agree	Disagree	Reply	Action Taken
					analyses should be straightforward. In conclusion, the monitoring frequency will be reduced to annually, and the monitoring of algal biomass shall coincide with pH, dissolved oxygen, and bioassessment.	