

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY
CONTROL BOARD
LOS ANGELES REGION**

ORDER NO. R4-2010-0060

AMENDING

ORDER NO. R4-2006-0091

NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0056227

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DONALD C. TILLMAN WATER RECLAMATION PLANT**

| | Page No. |
|---|----------|
| PURPOSE OF ORDER | 1 |
| LITIGATION HISTORY-CHRONOLOGY | 1 |
| FACILITY AND TREATMENT PROCESS DESCRIPTION | 4 |
| DISCHARGE OUTFALL AND RECEIVING WATER DESCRIPTION | 6 |
| DISCHARGE QUALITY DESCRIPTION | 7 |
| STUDIES | 9 |
| Lake Balboa Fish Tissue Study | 9 |
| Receiving Water Copper Translator and Hardness study, and Copper Analyses | 9 |
| Los Angeles River Diurnal Study | 11 |
| APPLICABLE LAWS, PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS | 11 |
| Federal Clean Water Act | 11 |
| Basin Plan | 12 |
| Sources of Drinking Water Policy | 13 |
| Potential Municipal and Domestic Supply (P* MUN) | 13 |
| State Implementation Policy (SIP) and California Toxics Rule (CTR) | 13 |
| Alaska Rule | 14 |
| Beneficial Uses | 14 |
| Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations | 16 |
| Antidegradation Policy | 17 |
| Watershed Approach | 18 |
| REGULATORY BASES FOR EFFLUENT AND DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS | 18 |
| Water quality Objectives and Effluent Limitations | 18 |
| Mass and concentration Limitations | 19 |
| Maximum Daily effluent Limitations | 20 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Pretreatment | 20 |
| Sludge Disposal | 20 |
| Storm Water Management | 20 |
| Clean Water Act Effluent Limitations | 21 |
| Antibacksliding Policies | 21 |
| Applicable Water Quality Objectives | 22 |
| Types of Pollutants | 22 |
| Technology-Based Limitations for Municipal Facilities (POTWs) | 23 |
| Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) | 23 |
| Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations for Toxic Pollutants | 23 |
| Stringency Requirements for Individual Pollutant | 23 |
| Basis for Effluent Limitations for 303(d) Listed Pollutants | 24 |
| CWA 303(d) Listed pollutants | 24 |
| Relevant Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) | 25 |
| Mixing Zones, Water Effects Ratio (WER), Translators, and Dilution Credits | 28 |
| REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS | 29 |
| Pollution Minimization Program | 33 |
| INTERIM REQUIREMENTS | 33 |
| CEQA COMPLIANCE | 34 |
| DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS | 35 |
| Effluent Limitations | 35 |
| Receiving Water Limitations for Surface Waters | 42 |
| SLUDGE REQUIREMENTS | 45 |
| PRETREATMENT REQUIREMENTS | 46 |

REQUIREMENTS AND PROVISIONS ----- 47
REOPENERS AND MODIFICATIONS ----- 54
EXPIRATION DATE ----- 55
RESCISSION ----- 55

ATTACHMENTS:

1. FIGURE 1 – The Vicinity Map and Water Quality Sampling Stations of the Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant
 2. FIGURE 2 – The Flow Diagram of Wastewater Treatment Processes at the Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant
- Biosolids Use and Disposal Requirements
- Generic Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Workplan for POTWs
- F. Fact Sheet including:
- Table A1 – Ammonia Nitrogen and Other Non-priority Pollutants Effluent Data
 - Table A2 – Temperature and pH Effluent Data, Ammonia Criterion Calculation
 - Table A3 – Ammonia Nitrogen and Other Non-priority Pollutants Effluent RPA
 - Table A4 – Priority Pollutants Effluent Data
 - Table A5 – Potential Analyses and Limitation Derivations
 - Table A6 – Revised Potential Analyses and Limitation Derivations for Cyanide, Tetrachloroethylene, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, and Gamma- BHC
 - Table A6r– Updated Potential Analyses and Limitation Derivations for Cyanide, Tetrachloroethylene, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, and Gamma- BHC
- IL. Calculations of Interim Limitations
- N. Standard Provisions
- P. Requirements for Pretreatment Annual Report
- T. Monitoring and Reporting Program

**State of California
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
LOS ANGELES REGION**

**ORDER NO. R4-2010-0060
AMENDING
ORDER NO. R4-2006-0091**

NPDES NO. CA0056227

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
(Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant)
(File No. 70-117)**

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (hereafter Regional Board), finds:

PURPOSE OF ORDER

1. The City of Los Angeles (City or Discharger) discharges tertiary-treated wastewater from its Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant (Tillman WRP or Plant) under Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) contained in Order No. 98-046, adopted by this Regional Board on June 15, 1998. Order No. 98-046 also serves as a permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES No. CA0056227), which regulates the discharge of treated wastewater to the Los Angeles River and its tributaries in Van Nuys, California, a water of the State of California and of the United States.
2. Order No. 98-046 has an expiration date of May 10, 2003. Section 122.6 of Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR), and section 2235.4 of Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), state that an expired permit continues in force until the effective date of a new permit, provided that the permittee has made a timely submittal of a complete application for a new permit. On July 1, 2002, the City filed a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) and applied to the Regional Board for reissuance of WDRs and NPDES permit to continuously discharge tertiary-treated wastewater. Therefore, the Discharger's permit has been administratively extended until the Regional Board acts on the new WDRs and NPDES permit.
3. This Order is the reissuance of WDRs that serves as a NPDES permit for the Tillman WRP.

LITIGATION HISTORY – CHRONOLOGY

4. **1998** – On July 14, 1998, the City filed a petition with the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) for a stay of Order No. 98-046. The State Board dismissed the City's petition for review and its request for stay without review for the Donald C. Tillman WRP's NPDES permit.

5. **1999** – On December 23, 1999, the City filed a Petition for a Writ of Mandate and application for stay challenging their permit (Order No. 98-046) and their associated Time Schedule Orders and Cease and Desist Order. On December 29, 1999, the Court issued a stay of the contested effluent limitations contained in these Orders.
6. **2000** – On January 20, 2000, the City filed an Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate and request for Stay challenging their permit (Order No. 98-046) and their Time Schedule Order (Order No. 98-070). On August 21, 2000, the City filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief with the United States District Court, Central District of California, Western Division, (*City of Los Angeles, City of Burbank, City of Simi Valley, and County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, by and through their agent County Sanitation District Number 2 of Los Angeles County vs. United States Environmental Protection Agency, and Alexis Strauss, Director, Water Division, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX [Case No. BS 060 957]*). The matter went before the court on August 31 and September 1, 2000. On November 30, 2000, the Superior Court filed its Decision on the matter [*Case No. BS 060 957*] and ordered counsel for the petitioner to prepare, serve, and lodge a proposed Statement of Decision, Judgement and Writ, on or before December 14, 2000 with a final decision overturning portions of USEPA's partial approval letter of May 26, 2000 related to the conditional potential MUN (P* MUN) beneficial use for surface waters. Respondents were given until December 28, 2000, to serve and file objections.
7. **2001** – Respondents filed objections on January 19, 2001, and Petitioners lodged a revised proposed Statement of Decision, Judgement of Writ, and a response to Respondent's objections on February 13, 2001. On April 4, 2001, the Superior Court signed and filed its final Statement of Decision, ordering that the judgment be entered granting the Petitioners' petition for a Writ of Mandamus, commanding the Respondents to vacate the Contested Effluent Limitations, and ordering the adoption of new effluent limitations at a new hearing. In June 2001, the Regional Board filed a notice of appeal with the State Court of Appeals contesting several, but not all, issues in the Superior Court's decision.
8. **2002** – In its December 24, 2002, opinion, the Court of Appeal unanimously reversed the trial court decision; and, made the following determinations:
 - A. **Cost Issues** – For existing objectives, water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) must be developed without reference to costs and Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 301(b)(1)(C) does apply to POTWs. (POTWs are not exempt from WQBELS.)
 - B. **CEQA Requirements** – The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) exemption in Section 13389 of the Water Code means that "CEQA imposes no additional procedural or substantive requirements" other than compliance with the CWA and Porter-Cologne Act. (NPDES permits are exempt from CEQA.)
 - C. **Compliance Schedules** – Compliance schedules may be included within a NPDES permit only if the applicable water quality standards or water quality control plans permit inclusion of compliance schedules. (Compliance schedules must be contained

in a Time Schedule Order or similar enforcement document if the Basin Plan does not allow the inclusion of compliance schedules in a NPDES permit.)

- D. **Narrative Toxicity** – The Regional Board's narrative toxicity objective which was upheld does not violate 40 CFR 131.11(a)(2). (The narrative standard can remain in NPDES permits as an effluent limitation.)

Although the Court of Appeal decided in favor of the State Board on every issue they appealed, the December 24, 2002, decision was not certified for publication at that time.

9. **2003** – In January 2003, the Court of Appeals took action to reconsider their decision. In February 2003, the Court of Appeals issued its final decision reversing the Superior Court's ruling on the issues appealed. On August 14, 2003, after rehearing, the Court of Appeals issued its final decision reversing the Superior Court's ruling on the issues appealed. The City of Los Angeles and City of Burbank (Cities) filed a petition with the Supreme Court on September 23, 2003. On November 19, 2003, the Supreme Court granted review of the Cities' Petition for Review of the underlying Court of Appeal decision. The granting of review automatically supercedes the Court of Appeal's decision and makes the decision no longer valid and precedent citable in court documents. The Cities submitted their opening briefs on December 19, 2003.
10. **2004** – On March 8, 2004, the State Board filed their Answer to the Cities' Opening Brief to the Supreme Court. The Cities submitted their reply to the State Board's Answer on March 28, 2004. On April 25, 2004, six amicus curiae briefs were submitted to the Supreme Court in favor of the Cities' position. One amicus curiae brief was submitted in opposition to the Cities' position by the NRDC. On May 10, 2004, the CA Supreme Court accepted all seven amicus curiae briefs. Answers to the amicus briefs were originally due on May 26, 2004; however, the State Board asked for an extension until June 25, 2004. The Cities did the same and both extensions were granted. The answers to the amicus briefs were submitted on June 25, 2004.
11. **2005** – Oral arguments for the Supreme Court were heard on January 4, 2005. An order from the Supreme Court limited the issue for oral argument to "Whether California's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act requires a Regional Water Quality Control Board to take into account compliance costs when it sets specific pollutant limitations in a wastewater discharge permit issued to a publicly owned wastewater treatment facility." On April 4, 2005, the California Supreme Court issued its decision, affirming the judgement of the Court of Appeal, reinstating the wastewater discharge permits to the extent that the specified numeric limitations on chemical pollutants are necessary to satisfy federal Clean Water Act requirements for treated wastewater. Ordinarily the Court's decision would become final 30 days after issuance (i.e., it would have become final on May 4, 2005); however, both the Water Boards and the Cities filed petitions for rehearing. The Supreme Court reviewed the petitions for rehearing and remanded one remaining issue back to the trial court for resolution. The trial court was required to determine whether or not the permit restrictions were "more stringent" than required by federal law.
12. **2006** – On June 28, 2006, the judge signed the Statement of Decision. The Court found that the following constituents had numeric effluent limitations more stringent than required

to meet the federal law existing at the time that the Regional Board adopted the NPDES permit: benzene, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, cadmium, chromium VI, 1,2-dichloroethane, ethylbenzene, lead, selenium, tetrachloroethylene, toluene, and toxaphene. The court issued a writ of mandate that also ordered the Regional Board to vacate the contested effluent limitations contained in Order No. 98-046, to file a return (a revised NPDES permit) with the Court by December 31, 2006, and that the stay of contested effluent limitations would remain in effect until the return is served and filed by the Respondents with the court. The court's determination that these effluent limitations were more stringent than required by federal law was based on the following: (1) Section 122.45(d)(2) of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations requires that effluent limitations be expressed as average weekly and average monthly concentrations unless impracticable, yet the Regional Board expressed the effluent limitations as daily maximum concentrations but did not include findings of impracticability; and (2) Some of these effluent limitations were imposed based upon the "P* MUN" beneficial use, which, in separate litigation, had been determined to be a conditional use designation, which has no legal effect until such time as the Regional Board undertakes additional study and amends the Basin Plan.

To comply with the writ, new permits were adopted by the Regional Board in November (Order No. R4-2006-0085 for Burbank) and December of 2006 (Order Nos. R4-2006-0091 and R4-2006-0092 for LA) ("Revised Permits"). The effective dates of these Revised Permits were December 29, 2006 for Burbank and February 2, 2007 for LA. The Regional Board filed a return to the writ of mandate on January 1, 2007.

Pursuant to Water Code section 13320, the Cities petitioned the State Board to review the Revised Permits on December 11, 2006 and on January 16, 2007, respectively. At the request of the Cities, the State Board placed those petitions in abeyance, and they currently remain in abeyance.

On March 29, 2007, the Cities moved to strike the return filed by the Regional Board. At the hearing, the Superior Court determined that the motion was not ripe because the Cities had not exhausted their administrative remedies by completing State Board review under Water Code section 13320, by way of the pending petitions. Accordingly, the Superior Court stayed the Cities' motion until the State Board has ruled on the Cities' pending petitions for review.

On January 25, 2010, Regional Board staff entered into a settlement agreement with the Cities in an effort to resolve the lawsuits and petitions challenging the Permits and Revised Permits adopted in 1998 and 2006. The settlement agreement includes provisions that a variety of negotiated modifications to this Permit would be brought before the Regional Board for its consideration. The settlement agreement did not bind the Regional Board's judgment in consideration of those modifications, but the modifications did reflect staff recommendations. The modifications to this Permit adopted on April 1, 2010 were the result of the public hearing on staff's proposals pursuant to the settlement agreement.

FACILITY AND TREATMENT PROCESS DESCRIPTION

13. The Tillman WRP is a publicly owned treatment work (POTW) owned and operated by the City's Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation. The Tillman WRP is located at

6100 Woodley Avenue, Van Nuys, California. Figure 1 is the vicinity map for the Tillman WRP. The Plant consists of two identical treatment trains, each with a dry weather average design capacity of 40 million gallons per day (mgd), for a total 80 mgd. In 2005, the average tertiary-treated municipal wastewater discharged to the Los Angeles River, at Van Nuys, California, was approximately 38 mgd.

14. The Tillman WRP is one of the three upstream water reclamation plants in the Hyperion Service Area (HSA) owned by the City of Los Angeles. The other two upstream plants are the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant and the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant.

The Bureau maintains and operates the Hyperion Treatment System which collects, treats, and processes municipal wastewater from domestic, commercial, and industrial sources from the entire city (except the Terminal Island Service Area surrounding the Los Angeles Harbor area) and from a number of cities and other agencies under contractual agreements. Sewage enters the Tillman WRP via both the Additional Valley Outfall Relief Sewer (AVORS) and the East Valley Interceptor Sewer (EVIS) from the communities of Chatsworth, Canoga Park, West Hills, Woodland Hills, Northridge, Granada Hills, and Van Nuys, and from the City of San Fernando, the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, and the Triunfo Canyon Sanitation District under contractual agreements. There are approximately 4 million people living in the Hyperion Service Area with approximately one million people in the San Fernando Valley served by the Tillman Plant.

In case of plant operational problems or a need for plant shutdown, wastewater can be diverted back to the AVORS for treatment at the Hyperion Treatment Plant.

15. The treatment system at the Tillman WRP currently consists of grit removal, screening, flow equalization, primary sedimentation, nitrification and denitrification (NDN*) activated sludge biological treatment with fine pore aeration, secondary clarification, coagulation, mixed dual media filtration (Hardinge Filters), disinfection by chlorination, and dechlorination. No facilities are provided for solids processing at the plant. Solids from the Plant are returned to the collection system for ultimate treatment and processing at the Hyperion Treatment Plant. Solids returned to the sewer consist of grit, primary and secondary sludge and skimmings, and filter backwash (approximately 10 mgd). Figure 2 is the schematic of wastewater flow.

*: **NDN** – In order to achieve compliance with the ammonia Basin Plan objectives, the City began to test the different NDN treatments, including Modified Ludzack-Ettinger (MLE) Process, Enhanced Modified Ludzack-Ettinger (eMLE) Process, Step-Feed Process. The City expects to complete construction of the NDN treatment facility in September 2007, and anticipates taking 90 days to optimize operation of the NDN facilities.

16. Flow to the plant consists of domestic, commercial and industrial wastewater. For Fiscal Year 2005, industrial wastewater represented approximately 10 % of the total flow to the plant.

17. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Board have classified the Tillman WRP as a major discharger. It has a Threat to Water Quality and Complexity rating of 1-A pursuant to CCR, Title 23, Section 2200.
18. Pursuant to 40 CFR, Part 403, the City developed, and has been implementing, an industrial wastewater Pretreatment Program for the Tillman WRP, which has been approved by the USEPA and the Regional Board.
19. The use of recycled water is regulated under Water Reclamation Requirements contained in Order No. 70-117. Order No. 70-117 was readopted on March 24, 1986, through blanket Order No. 86-039 and the same Order was readopted again on May 12, 1997, through blanket Order No. 97-072. Current uses include maintaining flows in the Japanese Garden Lake, Lake Balboa, and the Wildlife Lake, located in the Sepulveda Basin. Other approved cases include landscape irrigation and fire protection.
20. **Storm Water Management** – The City collects the initial flush of each storm event at the Tillman WRP and diverts it to the AVORS for treatment. After collection of the initial flush, the remaining stormwater is discharged to the Los Angeles River. The City has filed a Notice of Intent to comply with State Board's General NPDES Permit No. CAS000001 and Waste discharge requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities; has developed a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for storm water that does not enter the treatment system; and, has retained coverage under the General Industrial Storm Water permit.

The industrial stormwater discharge is not regulated under this individual NPDES permit, but is instead regulated under the Statewide General Stormwater Permit for Industrial discharges.

DISCHARGE OUTFALL AND RECEIVING WATER DESCRIPTION

21. The Tillman WRP discharges tertiary-treated effluent to the upper Los Angeles River, a water of the United States, at a point located 878 feet downstream of the Sepulveda Dam Spillway (Discharge Serial No. 008: Latitude 34⁰ 09' 54", Longitude 118⁰ 28' 15"), (see Attachment 1 - Discharge Outfalls).
22. The Tillman WRP is located within the Sepulveda Dam Basin. The 100-year flood water surface elevation under the "U.S. Corps of Engineers Modified Spillway Gate Operating Plan" for the Sepulveda Dam Basin is 714.4 feet. The City's Department of Public Works in 1994 completed construction of a berm surrounding the Tillman Plant to a finished elevation of 715 feet. The City also completed construction in 1993 of Discharge Serial No. 008, located downstream of the Sepulveda Dam and downstream of Discharge Serial No. 001, which was formerly used as the discharge outfall for the Plant prior to the use of Discharge Serial No. 008. Discharge Serial No. 001 is now inactive but is still in place. The berm and new outfall (Discharge Serial No. 008) were measures necessary to protect the Plant from flood conditions within the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin.
23. The City is currently using treated effluent to maintain the Japanese Garden, the recreation lake (Lake Balboa), and the Wildlife Lake. The Wildlife and Recreation Lakes are operated

and maintained by the City's Department of Recreation and Parks. The Department of Recreation and Parks has developed management plans for these lakes, which include measures to be implemented in the operation, maintenance, and monitoring of the Lakes.

24. The Department of Recreation and Parks has used up to 17 mgd of treated effluent as recycled water in the 27.5-acre Lake Balboa. The treated effluent is discharged from the Plant to the Lake at the southeast corner of Victory and Balboa Boulevards, Los Angeles, (Discharge Serial No. 002: Latitude 34° 10' 38", Longitude 118° 28'20"). The treated effluent flows through the Lake and eventually discharges through weirs, spillways and a bottom drain to three Outfalls: at Bull Creek (Lake Discharge Serial No. 004), Hayvenhurst Channel (Lake Discharge Serial No. 005), and the Los Angeles River (Lake Discharge Serial No. 006). Bull Creek and Hayvenhurst Channel are tributaries to the Los Angeles River above the Estuary (see Figure 1).
25. The Department of Recreation and Parks uses approximately 5 mgd of treated effluent as recycled water for the Wildlife Lake and approximately 2 mgd in Haskell Flood Control Channel during September through May. The treated effluent flows by gravity to the Wildlife Lake located northeast of Burbank Boulevard and Woodley Avenue (Discharge Serial No. 003: Latitude 34° 10' 38", Longitude 118° 28' 20"). The treated effluent flows through the 10-acre Wildlife Lake and is discharged to the Haskell Flood Control Channel (Lake Discharge Serial No. 007), thence to the Los Angeles River, above the Estuary (see Figure 1).

During the summer months, the Wildlife Lake may be drained (for maintenance and to minimize nuisance resulting from mosquito breeding), resulting in as increased discharge of treated effluent to Haskell Flood Control Channel up to 5 mgd.

DISCHARGE QUALITY DESCRIPTION

26. From January 1998 to December 2005, the Discharger's discharge monitoring reports showed the following:
 - A. Treated wastewater average annual dry weather effluent flow rate of approximately 50 mgd.
 - B. Average annual removal rate of >95% and >99%, for BOD and total suspended solids, respectively.
 - C. 7-day median and daily maximum coliform values as <1 coliform forming units (MPN)/ 100 ml in the treated wastewater.
27. The characteristics of the wastewater discharged, based on data submitted in the 2005 Annual Summary discharge monitoring report, are as follows in Table P1. The "<" symbol indicates that the pollutant was not detected (ND) at that concentration level. It is not known if the pollutant was present at a lower concentration.

| Table P1 - 2005 Annual Summary Effluent Monitoring Summary | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| CTR# | Constituent | Unit | Average | Maximum | Minimum |
| | Flow | mgd | 38.3 | 74.0 | 17.0 |
| | pH | pH units | 7.4 | 7.6 | 6.8 |
| | Temperature- winter (Nov. – April) | °F | 72 winter | 75 | 70 |
| | summer (May – Oct.) | °F | 80 summer | 82 | 76 |
| | BOD _{5@20°C} | mg/L | 7 | 9 | 5 |
| | Suspended solids | mg/L | <1 | 2.6 | <1 |
| | Settleable solids | ml/L | <0.1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| | Total dissolved solids | mg/L | 614 | 948 | 449 |
| | Chloride | mg/L | 113 | 152 | 82 |
| | Sulfate | mg/L | 155 | 309 | 103 |
| | Boron | mg/L | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| | Total Phosphate | mg/L | 1.7 | 2.56 | 1.15 |
| | Turbidity (24-HR composite) | NTU | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| | Oil and grease | mg/L | <0.1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| | Fluoride | mg/L | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| | MBAS | mg/L | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.07 |
| | Residual Chlorine (Dechlorinated) | mg/L | <0.7 | 7.0 | <0.1 |
| | Total Coliform | MPN/100mL | <1 | 2 | <1 |
| | Ammonia-N | mg/L | 17.5 | 22.3 | 17.6 |
| | Organic-N | mg/L | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.8 |
| | Nitrate-N | mg/L | 0.88 | 4.57 | 0.32 |
| | Nitrite-N | mg/L | 0.58 | 1.50 | 0.34 |
| | Nitrate + Nitrite | mg/L | 1.5 | 5.3 | 1.2 |
| | Total Nitrogen | mg/L | 22.9 | 25.9 | 21.3 |
| | Total Hardness | mg/L | 228 | 418 | 160 |
| 1 | Antimony | ug/L | 1.00 | 1.45 | 0.45 |
| 2 | Arsenic | ug/L | <2.1 | 3.7 | <0.4 |
| 3 | Beryllium | ug/L | <0.4 | <0.4 | <0.4 |
| 4 | Cadmium | ug/L | <0.3 | <0.3 | <0.3 |
| 5 | Chromium total | ug/L | <3.3 | 26.9 | <0.1 |
| 6 | Copper | ug/L | <4 | <4 | <4 |
| 7 | Lead | ug/L | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| 8 | Mercury | ug/L | <0.022 | <0.022 | <0.022 |
| 9 | Nickel | ug/L | <2.9 | 24 | <1 |
| 10 | Selenium | ug/L | <1.18 | 6.7 | <0.2 |
| 11 | Silver | ug/L | 0.61 | 1.38 | 0.27 |
| 12 | Thallium | ug/L | <0.13 | 0.24 | <0.01 |
| 13 | Zinc | ug/L | <39.4 | 60 | <4 |
| 14 | Cyanide | ug/L | <4 | <4 | <4 |
| 23 | Dibromochloromethane | ug/L | <0.69 | 2.38 | <0.12 |
| 26 | Chloroform | ug/L | 3.16 | 4.78 | 2.01 |
| 27 | Bromodichloromethane | ug/L | <0.71 | 2.03 | <0.1 |
| 35 | Methyl chloride (Chloromethane) | ug/L | <0.36 | 1.03 | <0.14 |

| Table P1 - 2005 Annual Summary Effluent Monitoring Summary | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| CTR# | Constituent | Unit | Average | Maximum | Minimum |
| 54 | Phenol | ug/L | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| 68 | Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate | ug/L | <0.6 | 1.8 | <0.3 |
| 77 | 1,4-Dichlorobenzene | ug/L | 1.25 | 1.77 | 0.97 |
| 81 | Di-n-butyl phthalate | ug/L | <0.30 | 1.23 | <0.07 |
| | Remaining priority pollutants* | ug/L | ND | ND | ND |
| | Mirex | ug/L | <0.008 | <0.008 | <0.008 |
| | Methoxychlor | ug/L | <0.007 | <0.007 | <0.007 |
| | 2,4-D | ug/L | <0.02 | <0.02 | <0.02 |
| | 2,4,5-TP | ug/L | <0.01 | <0.01 | <0.01 |

All numeric detection limitations of remaining priority pollutants are available in the accompanying Fact Sheet.

STUDIES

28. Lake Balboa Fish Tissue Study

- A. The Lake Balboa Fish Tissue Study for Tillman WRP was conducted to fulfill a requirement of the Time Schedule Order No. 98-070. The purpose of the Study was to determine the degree of pollutant bioaccumulation, which occurs in fish caught in Lake Balboa and to determine if the human consumption of these fish is likely to cause an unacceptable risk to human health.
- B. The Final Report for this Study, submitted by the City on September 29, 2000, concluded that the current monthly average effluent limitations for lindane, total DDT, and dieldrin for the Tillman WRP’s discharge into Lake Balboa are adequate to protect human health from fish tissue uptake to concentrations likely to cause unacceptable risk to human health.

29. Receiving Water Copper Translator and Hardness Study, and Copper Analyses

- A. The City of Los Angeles proposed a site-specific copper conversion factor for the areas downstream of the Tillman WRP based on a study performed by Larry Walker Associates (LWA) (LWA, 2003). For the area downstream of the Tillman WRP, the proposed conversion factors for copper were 0.57 for chronic and 0.72 for acute (Table P2). EPA and the Regional Board expressed concern about the use of these numbers given the lack of consistent relationships between total recoverable and dissolved concentrations in the dataset.

| Table P2 - Receiving Water Copper Translator and Hardness for Tillman WRP | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Copper Translator (Dissolved/Total) | | | | |
| Chronic | 0.57 | | | |
| Acute | 0.72 | | | |
| Hardness (mg/L) | | | | |
| | Dry Season | | Wet Season | |
| | Above Outfall | Below Outfall | Above Outfall | Below Outfall |
| Average | 733 | 229 | 777 | 325 |
| Median | 708 | 212 | 752 | 282 |
| Minimum | 588 | 186 | 646 | 222 |
| Maximum | 918 | 434 | 889 | 518 |
| N | 23 | 35 | 9 | 13 |

A hardness value of 246 mg/L was used to convert the dissolved metal CTR criteria into the total recoverable metal form. The detailed information is available in Finding No. 59.B.b.i. of this Order.

- B. Suspecting that the relationship between hardness and copper concentrations may be affected by total suspended solids, LWA used partition coefficient modeling to account for variation due to total suspended solids. In this approach, the conversion factor is the dissolved fraction, calculated using a site-specific partition coefficient and total suspended solids. This is in accordance with EPA guidance for calculating the conversion factor (USEPA, 1996) and is allowed for in the SIP (SWRCB, 2000). Using this approach LWA proposed using 0.74 as a chronic conversion factor and 0.92 as an acute conversion factor for the area located downstream of Tillman WRP. Because the revised values were determined according to EPA and SIP guidances, they have been adopted and used in TMDL Resolution R05-006 for the areas of the Los Angeles River located downstream of the Tillman WRP. These conversion factors will be used in Reasonable Potential Analysis for copper in this permit.

- C. While all testing requires an ELAP-Certified Laboratory, the City of Los Angeles provided a rationale for selecting non-certified Frontier Geosciences Laboratory, because of its ability to perform testing at low detection limitation for copper (0.1 µg/L). There are no California laboratories under ELAP-Certification capable of performing such low-level tests.
 - a. On January 9, 2002, the City transmitted documents, containing four items listed below requested by the Regional Board staff, requiring the use of Frontier Geosciences Laboratory to analyze the samples for the Los Angeles River Copper Translator Study.
 - i. Standard Operating Procedure;
 - ii. Data regarding Detection Limitation Studies;

- iii. Example of Copper Testing Analytical Runs Including Calibrations, Sample Analysis, Duplicates, and Spikes; and
 - iv. Performance Evaluation Study Results
- b. In accordance with Standard Provisions Applicable to Waste Discharge Requirements, Item 14 “Unless otherwise permitted by the Regional Board Executive Officer, all analyses shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the State Department of Health Services. The Regional Board Executive Officer may allow use of an uncertified laboratory under exceptional circumstances, such as when the closest laboratory to the monitoring location is outside the State boundaries and therefore not subject to certification.” Therefore, the Executive Officer approved the City’s use of the Frontier Geosciences Laboratory for the low detection analyses of copper for the translator study on February 11, 2002.

30. **Los Angeles River Diurnal Study**

The 2005 Los Angeles River Diurnal Study was submitted to the Regional Board in July 2005. Included herein is a synopsis of the Report and explanation of historical occurrences:

During the hot summer months, the Plant occasionally exceeds the receiving water permit levels for DO and/or temperature. In the past, these exceedances were not considered violations by the City of Los Angeles, based on the results of a small Diurnal Study performed in 1991, which has since been lost due to its storage in an outdated computer format. A new study was conducted from September 2002 to September 2003 to determine the seasonal and diurnal pattern of pH, DO, and temperature in the L.A. River at sampling locations upstream and downstream of the Plant’s discharge. The Study also would assess whether any exceedance of the limitations at the downstream station (R-7) are a result of the effluent discharged. Results of this Diurnal Study show that exceedances of DO and temperature at R-7 are caused by the natural seasonal and diurnal pattern of the River or the physical environment of the sampling location, and are not directly a result of the effluent discharged, and should not be considered a violation of the NPDES permit. The results of this Diurnal Study also indicate that the optimum time to sample Receiving Water Station R-7 to obtain a sample representative of the majority of the day, is from 0900 to 1100.

APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

31. **Federal Clean Water Act** – Section 301(a) of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires that point source discharges of pollutants to a water of the United States must be done in conformance with a NPDES permit. NPDES permits establish effluent limitations that incorporate various requirements of the CWA designed to protect and to enhance water quality. CWA section 402 authorizes the USEPA or States with an approved NPDES program to issue NPDES permits. The State of California has an approved NPDES program.

32. **Basin Plan** – The Regional Board adopted a revised *Water Quality Control Plan, Los Angeles Region: Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties* (Basin Plan) on June 13, 1994, and amended it by various Regional Board Resolutions. This updated and consolidated plan represents the Board’s master water quality control planning document and regulations. The State Board and the State of California Office of Administrative Law (OAL) approved the revised Basin Plan on November 17, 1994, and February 23, 1995, respectively. On May 26, 2000, the USEPA approved the revised Basin Plan except for the implementation plan for potential municipal and domestic supply (P* MUN) designated surface waterbodies, which is not applicable to this discharge.

Ammonia Water Quality Objective (WQO) – The 1994 Basin Plan contained water quality objectives for ammonia to protect aquatic life, in Tables 3-1 through Tables 3-4. However, those ammonia objectives were revised on April 25, 2002, by the Regional Board, with the adoption of Resolution No. 2002-011, Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Update the Ammonia Objectives for Inland Surface Waters (including enclosed bays, estuaries and wetlands) with Beneficial Use designations for protection of Aquatic Life. Resolution No. 2002-011 was approved by the State Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA on April 30, 2003, June 5, 2003, and June 19, 2003, respectively, and are now in effect. The final effluent limitations for ammonia prescribed in this Order are based on the revised ammonia criteria (see Attachment H) and apply at the end of pipe.

Chloride WQO – The 1994 Basin Plan contained water quality objectives for chloride in Table 3-8. However, the chloride objectives for some waterbodies were revised on January 27, 1997, by the Regional Board, with the adoption of Resolution No. 97-02, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a Policy for Addressing Levels of Chloride in Discharges of Wastewaters*. Resolution No. 97-02 was approved by the State Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA on October 23, 1997, January 9, 1998, and February 5, 1998, respectively, and are now in effect. The chloride WQO was revised from 150 mg/L to 190 mg/L, for the following segments of the Los Angeles River:

- A. Between Sepulveda Flood Control Basin and Figueroa Street (including Burbank Western Channel only), and,
- B. Between Figueroa Street and the estuary (including Rio Hondo below Santa Ana Freeway only).

The final effluent limitations for chloride prescribed in this Order are based on the revised chloride WQOs and apply at the end of pipe.

The Basin Plan (i) designates beneficial uses for surface and groundwater, (ii) sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated (existing and potential) beneficial uses and conform to the State’s antidegradation policy, and (iii) includes implementation provisions, programs, and policies to protect all waters in the Region. In addition, the Basin Plan incorporates (by reference) all applicable State and Regional Board plans and policies and other pertinent water

quality policies and regulations. The 1994 Basin Plan was prepared to be consistent with all State and Regional Board plans and policies adopted in 1994 and earlier. This Order implements the plans, policies, and provisions of the Board's Basin Plan.

33. **Sources of Drinking Water Policy** – On May 19, 1988, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) adopted Resolution No. 88-63, *Sources of Drinking Water (SODW) Policy*, which established a policy that all surface and ground waters, with limited exemptions, are suitable or potentially suitable for municipal and domestic supply. To be consistent with State Board's SODW policy, on March 27, 1989, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 89-03, Incorporation of Sources of Drinking Water Policy into *the Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) – Santa Clara River Basin (4A)/ Los Angeles River Basin (4B)*.
34. **Potential Municipal and Domestic Supply (P* MUN)** – Consistent with Regional Board Resolution No. 89-03 and State Board Resolution No. 88-63, in 1994 the Regional Board conditionally designated all inland surface waters in Table 2-1 of the 1994 Basin Plan as existing, intermittent, or potential for Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN). However, the conditional designation in the 1994 Basin Plan included the following implementation provision: “no new effluent limitations will be placed in Waste Discharge Requirements as a result of these [potential MUN designations made pursuant to the SODW policy and the Regional Board's enabling resolution] until the Regional Board adopts [a special Basin Plan Amendment that incorporates a detailed review of the waters in the Region that should be exempted from the potential MUN designations arising from SODW policy and the Regional Board's enabling resolution].” On February 15, 2002, as a result of a legal challenge and federal court order, the USEPA clarified its partial approval (May 26, 2000) of the 1994 Basin Plan amendments and acknowledged that the conditional designations do not currently have a legal effect, do not reflect new water quality standards subject to USEPA review, and do not support new effluent limitations based on the conditional designations stemming from the SODW Policy until a subsequent review by the Regional Board finalizes the designations for these waters. This permit is designed to be consistent with the existing Basin Plan.
35. **State Implementation Plan (SIP) and California Toxics Rule (CTR)** – The State Board adopted the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (also known as the State Implementation Plan or SIP) on March 2, 2000. The SIP was amended by Resolution No. 2000-30, on April 26, 2000, and the Office of Administrative Law approved the SIP on April 28, 2000. On this date, the SIP became effective with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP applies to discharges of toxic pollutants in the inland surface waters, enclosed bays and estuaries of California which are subject to regulation under the State's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Division 7 of the Water Code) and the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA). This policy also establishes the following:
 - A. Implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria promulgated by USEPA through the CTR and for priority pollutant objectives established by Regional Boards in their Basin Plans;

- B. Monitoring requirements for priority pollutants with insufficient data to determine reasonable potential;
- C. Monitoring requirements for 2, 3, 7, 8 – TCDD equivalents; and
- D. Chronic toxicity control provisions.

The CTR became effective on May 18, 2000 (codified as 40 CFR Part 131.38). The SIP (which implements CTR criteria) was revised by the State Board on February 24, 2005. The revised SIP became effective on May 31, 2005. Toxic pollutant limitations are prescribed in this Order to implement the CTR, the SIP, and Basin Plan.

In the CTR, USEPA promulgated criteria that protects the general population at an incremental cancer risk level of one in a million (10^{-6}), for all priority toxic pollutants regulated as carcinogens. USEPA recognizes that adoption of a different risk factor is outside of the scope of the CTR. However, states have the discretion to adopt water quality criteria that result in a higher risk level, if they can demonstrate that the chosen risk level is adequately protective of the most highly exposed subpopulation, and have completed all necessary public participation. This demonstration has not happened in California. Further, the information that is available on highly exposed subpopulations in California supports the need to protect the general population at the 10^{-6} level. The Discharger may undertake a study, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Chapter 3 of USEPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition (EPA-823-B-005a, August 1994) to demonstrate that a different risk factor is more appropriate. Upon completion of the study, the State Board will review the results and determine if the risk factor needs to be changed. In the mean time, the State will continue using a 10^{-6} risk level, as it has done historically, to protect the population against carcinogenic pollutants.

- 36. **Alaska Rule** – On March 30, 2000, USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised State and Tribal water quality standards (WQS) become effective for CWA purposes (40 CFR 131.21, 65 FR 24641, April 27, 2000). Under USEPA’s new regulation (also known as the *Alaska Rule*), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after May 30, 2000, must be approved before being used for CWA purposes. The final rule also provides that standards already in effect and submitted to USEPA by May 30, 2000, may be used for CWA purposes, whether or not approved by EPA.
- 37. **Beneficial Uses** – The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives and beneficial uses for the Los Angeles River and its contiguous waters.

- A. The beneficial uses of the receiving surface water are:

| Los Angeles River upstream of Figueroa Street - Hydrologic Unit 405.21 | |
|---|---|
| Existing: | ground water recharge; contact ^[3] and non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; and wetland habitat ^[1] . |
| Potential: | municipal and domestic supply ^[2] ; and industrial service supply. |
| Los Angeles River downstream of Figueroa Street - Hydrologic Unit 405.15 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Existing: | ground water recharge; contact ^[3] and non-contact water recreation; and warm freshwater habitat. |
| Potential: | municipal and domestic supply ^[2] ; industrial service supply; and wildlife habitat. |
| Los Angeles River downstream of Figueroa Street - Hydrologic Unit 405.12 | |
| Existing: | ground water recharge; contact ^[3] and non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; marine habitat; wildlife habitat; and rare, threatened, or endangered species. |
| Potential: | municipal and domestic supply ^[2] ; industrial service supply; industrial process supply; migration of aquatic organisms; spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; and shellfish harvesting ^[3] . |
| Los Angeles River Estuary - Hydrologic Unit 405.12 | |
| Existing: | industrial service supply; navigation; contact and non-contact water recreation; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; wildlife habitat; rare, threatened, or endangered species ^[4] ; migration of aquatic organisms ^[5] ; spawning, reproduction, and/or early development ^[5] ; and wetland habitat ^[2] . |
| Potential: | shellfish harvesting. |

Footnote:

- [1]. This wetland habitat may be associated with only a portion of the waterbody. Any regulatory action would require a detailed analysis of the area.
- [2]. The potential municipal and domestic supply beneficial uses for the water body is consistent with the State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 88-63 and Regional Board Resolution No. 89-003; however, the Regional Board has only designated the MUN beneficial use and at this time cannot establish effluent limitations designed to protect the conditional designation.
- [3]. Access prohibited by Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
- [4]. One or more rare species utilize estuaries and coastal wetlands for foraging and/or nesting.
- [5]. Aquatic organisms utilize estuary and coastal wetland, to a certain extent, for spawning and early development. This may include migration into areas, which are heavily influenced by freshwater inputs.

B. The beneficial uses of the receiving groundwater are:

| | |
|--|---|
| San Fernando Basins (East of Highway 405 overall) – DWR Basin No. ^[1] 4-12 | |
| Existing: | municipal and domestic supply; industrial service supply; industrial process supply; and agricultural supply. |

| Los Angeles Coastal Plain (Central Basin) – DWR Basin No. ^[1] 4-11 | |
|--|---|
| Existing: | municipal and domestic supply; industrial service supply; industrial process supply; and agricultural supply. |
| Los Angeles Coastal Plain (West Basin) – DWR Basin No. ^[1] 4-11 | |
| Existing: | municipal and domestic supply; industrial service supply; industrial process supply; and agricultural supply. |

Footnote:

[1]. Basins are numbered according to DWR Bulletin No. 118-80 (DWR, 1980).

- C. The requirements in this Order are intended to protect designated beneficial uses and enhance the water quality of the watershed. Effluent limitations must protect both existing and potential beneficial uses.
38. **Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations** – The California Department of Health Services established primary and secondary maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for inorganic, organic, and radioactive contaminants in drinking water.

These MCLs are codified in Title 22, California Code of Regulations (Title 22). The Basin Plan (Chapter 3) incorporates Title 22 primary MCLs by reference. This incorporation by reference is prospective including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect. Title 22 primary MCLs have been used as bases for effluent limitations in WDRs and NPDES permits to protect the groundwater recharge beneficial use when that receiving groundwater is designated as MUN. Also, the Basin Plan specifies that “Ground waters shall not contain taste or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.” Therefore the secondary MCL’s, which are limitations based on aesthetic, organoleptic standards, are also incorporated into this permit to protect groundwater quality.

MCL Development Process – Health and Safety Code §116365(a) requires the Department of Health Services (DHS), while placing primary emphasis on the protection of public health, to establish a contaminant's maximum contaminant level (MCL) at a level as close as is technically and economically feasible to its public health goal (PHG). The PHG—established by Cal/EPA's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)—is the contaminant's concentration in drinking water that does not pose any significant risk to health, derived from a human health risk assessment.

As part of the MCL process, DHS evaluates the technical and economic feasibility of regulating a chemical contaminant. Technical feasibility includes an evaluation of commercial laboratories' ability to analyze for and detect the chemical in drinking water, the costs of monitoring, and the costs of treatment required to remove it. Costs are required by law to be considered whenever MCLs are adopted.

Then, the proposed MCL moves through a formal regulatory process. DHS releases proposed regulations for a 45-day public comment period. If any "Post-hearing" changes made in response to comments, DHS subsequently provides an additional 15-day public comment period. Once DHS completes its process, it submits the regulation package, including responses to public comments, to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). OAL has 30 working days to review the regulation and approve or reject it. If approved by OAL, it is filed with the Secretary of State, becoming effective in 30 calendar days.

Groundwater Recharge – Sections of the Los Angeles River, downstream of the Tillman WRP discharge points, are designated as GWR. Surface water from the Los Angeles River enters the San Fernando Valley and the Central Los Angeles Coastal Plain Groundwater Basins. The depth to groundwater below the Tillman WRP is approximately 47 feet below ground surface. Since ground water from these Basins is used to provide drinking water to people, Title 22-based limitations are needed to protect that drinking water supply. By limiting the contaminants in the Tillman WRP discharge, the amount of pollutants entering the surface waters and groundwater basins are correspondingly reduced. Once groundwater basins are contaminated, it may take years to clean up, depending on the pollutant. Compared to surface water pollution, investigations and remediation of groundwater are often more difficult, costly, and extremely slow. However, the effluent data showed no exceedances of Title 22-based limitations, therefore, the Title 22-based effluent limitations will not be included in this revised Order.

Groundwater levels in the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin) have been fairly stable over the past 20 years since adjudication of the Basin. However, hydrographs show a variation of approximately 5 feet to 40 feet in the western part of the Basin, 40 feet in the southern and northern parts of the Basin, and a variation of approximately 80 feet in the eastern part of the Basin (Update 2003, Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118 *California's Groundwater*).

Groundwater Data obtained from the Regional Boards' Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program database was reviewed. Groundwater monitoring wells in the vicinity of the Glendale Narrows soft-bottom Los Angeles River area indicate that groundwater ranges between 5 to 55.6 feet below ground surface. The base of the Los Angeles River channel is approximately 24 feet below ground surface (July 2004, Appendix A Details of Channel Geometry, *Modeling Analysis for the Development of TMDLs for Metals in the Los Angeles River and Tributaries*). Therefore groundwater is encountered down to approximately 30 feet below the base of the Los Angeles River. Depending upon groundwater pumping rates and seasonal variation, the soft-bottom reach of the Los Angeles River can act as both a gaining and losing stream situation. Thus, there is the potential for interaction and mixing of groundwater and surface water in the effluent-dominated Los Angeles River. In times of drought, when the groundwater table drops, the Glendale Narrows segment of the Los Angeles River is more of a losing stream, because surface water percolates to recharge the groundwater basin.

39. **Antidegradation Policy** – On October 28, 1968, the State Board adopted Resolution No. 68-16, *Maintaining High Quality Water*, which established an antidegradation policy for State and Regional Boards. The State Board has, in State Board Order No. 86-17 and an October 7, 1987 guidance memorandum, interpreted Resolution No. 68-16 to be fully

consistent with the federal antidegradation policy. Similarly, the CWA (section 304(d)(4)(B)) and USEPA regulations (40 CFR, Section 131.12) require that all permitting actions be consistent with the federal antidegradation policy. Together, the State and Federal policies are designed to ensure that a water body will not be degraded resulting from the permitted discharge. The provisions of this Order are consistent with the antidegradation policies.

40. ***Watershed Approach*** – This Regional Board has been implementing a Watershed Management Approach (WMA), to address water quality protection in the Los Angeles Region, as detailed in the Watershed Management Initiative (WMI). The WMI is designed to integrate various surface and ground water regulatory programs while promoting cooperative, collaborative efforts within a watershed. It is also designed to focus limited resources on key issues and use sound science. Information about the Los Angeles River Watershed and other watersheds in the region can be obtained from the Regional Board's web site at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/> and clicking on the word "Watersheds".

Pursuant to this Regional Board's watershed initiative framework, the Los Angeles River Watershed Management Area was the targeted watershed for fiscal year 1999-2000. However, the NPDES permit renewals were originally re-scheduled for the 2002-2003 fiscal year so that provisions of the CTR and SIP could be incorporated into the permits. However, delays in the renewal were caused by lengthy litigation.

REGULATORY BASES FOR EFFLUENT AND RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

41. ***Water Quality Objectives and Effluent Limitations*** – *Water Quality Objectives (WQOs)* and effluent limitations in this permit are based on:
- A. Applicable State Regulations/Policies/Guidances
 - a. The plans, policies and water quality standards (beneficial uses + objectives + antidegradation policy) contained in the 1994 *Water Quality Control Plan, Los Angeles Region: Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties*, as amended, including chemical constituent limitations established by incorporating the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Maximum Contaminant Levels designed to protect the existing drinking water use of the receiving groundwaters;
 - b. California Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.38);
 - c. The State Board's "Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California" (the State Implementation Plan or SIP), 2000;
 - d. Administrative Procedures Manual and Administrative Procedure Updates; and,
 - e. Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act (Water Code § 13000 et seq).

- B. Applicable Federal Regulations/Policies/Guidances
- a. Federal Clean Water Act,
 - b. 40 CFR Parts 122, 131, among others,
 - c. Best Professional Judgment (pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44),
 - d. USEPA Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Programs Final, May 31, 1996;
 - e. USEPA Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy (EPA-833-B-94-002), July 1994;
 - f. Inspectors Guide for Evaluation of Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants, April 1979 (EPA/430/9-79-010);
 - g. Fate of Priority Pollutants in Publicly Owned Treatment Works Pilot Study October 1979 (EPA-440/1-79-300);
 - h. *Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control*, March 1991 (EPA-505/ 2-90-001);
 - i. *U.S. EPA NPDES Permit Writers' Manual*, December 1996 (EPA-833-B-96-003);
 - j. USEPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria: 2002, November 2002 (EPA –822-R-02-047);
 - k. *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms*, October, 2002 (EPA-821-R-02-012); and,
 - l. *Short Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms*, October 2002 (EPA-821-R-02-013).

Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established in the Basin Plan, 40 CFR Part 122.44(d) specifies that water quality based effluent limitations may be set based on USEPA criteria and supplemented where necessary by other relevant information to attain and maintain narrative water quality criteria to fully protect designated beneficial uses.

42. **Mass and Concentration Limitations** – 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(1) requires that, except under certain conditions, all permit limitations, standards, or prohibitions be expressed in terms of mass units. 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(2) allows the permit writer, at their discretion, to express limitations in additional units (e.g., concentration units). The regulations mandate that, where limitations are expressed in more than one unit, the permittee must comply with both.

Generally, mass-based limitations ensure that proper treatment, and not dilution, is employed to comply with the final effluent concentration limitations. Concentration-based effluent limitations, on the other hand, discourage the reduction in treatment efficiency during low-flow periods and require proper operation of the treatment units at all times. In the absence of concentration-based effluent limitations, a permittee would be able to increase its effluent concentration (i.e., reduce its level of treatment) during low-flow periods and still meet its mass-based limitations. To account for this, this permit includes mass and concentration limitations for some constituents; however, the mass-based limitations are inappropriate during wet weather flows when plant flows may exceed design capacity. Therefore, during storm events when flows exceed design capacity, only concentration-based limitations are applicable.

43. **Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations** – Pursuant to 40 CFR section 122.45(d)(2), for POTWs continuous discharges, all permit effluent limitations, standards, and prohibitions, including those necessary to achieve water quality standards, shall, unless impracticable, be stated as average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations. It is impracticable to only include average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations for certain pollutants in the permits, because a single daily discharge of certain pollutants, in excess amounts, can cause violations of water quality objectives. The effects of certain pollutants on aquatic organisms are often rapid. For many pollutants, an average weekly or average monthly effluent limitation alone is not sufficiently protective of beneficial uses. As a result, maximum daily effluent limitations, as referenced in 40 CFR section 122.45(d)(1), are included in the permit for certain constituents as discussed in the Fact Sheet accompanying this Order.
44. **Pretreatment** – Pursuant to 40 CFR Part 403, the City developed and has been implementing an approved industrial wastewater Pretreatment Program for POTWs owned and operated by the City. The City's Pretreatment Program was approved by USEPA on June 30, 1983. In 1989, USEPA delegated the authority to administer pretreatment programs in California to the State Board and Regional Boards. Thus, this Regional Board became the approval authority of pretreatment programs in the Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. This Order requires the City to continue the implementation of the approved Pretreatment Program and modifications thereof.
45. **Sludge Disposal** – To implement CWA Section 405(d), on February 19, 1993, the USEPA promulgated 40 CFR, Part 503 to regulate the use and disposal of municipal sewage sludge. This regulation was amended on September 3, 1999. The regulation requires that producers of sewage sludge meet certain reporting, handling, and disposal requirements. It is the responsibility of the City to comply with said regulations that are enforceable by USEPA, because California has not been delegated the authority to implement this program.
46. **Storm Water Management** – CWA section 402(p), as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1987, requires NPDES permits for storm water discharges. Pursuant to this requirement, in 1990, USEPA promulgated 40 CFR section 122.26 that established requirements for storm water discharges under a NPDES program. To facilitate compliance with federal regulations, on November 1991, the State Board issued a statewide general permit, *General NPDES Permit No. CAS000001 and Waste Discharge*

Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities. This permit was amended in September 1992 and reissued on April 17, 1997 in State Board Order No. 97-03-DWQ to regulate storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. The Tillman WRP is covered by general NPDES permit No. CAS000001. The City developed and currently implements a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), to comply with the State Board's Order No. 97-03-DWQ.

47. **Clean Water Act Effluent Limitations** – Numeric and narrative effluent limitations are established pursuant to Section 301 (Effluent Limitations), Section 302 (Water Quality-Related Effluent Limitations), Section 303 (Water Quality Standards and Implementation Plans), Section 304 (Information and Guidelines [Effluent]), Section 305 (Water Quality Inventory), Section 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards), and Section 402 (NPDES) of the CWA. The CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharges herein.
48. **Antibacksliding Policies** – Antibacksliding provisions are contained in Sections 303(d)(4) and 402(o) of the CWA, and in 40 CFR section 122.44(l). Those provisions require a reissued permit to be as stringent as the previous permit with some exceptions. Section 402(o) of the CWA establishes express statutory language prohibiting the backsliding of effluent limitations. It consists of the following three parts:
- A. Section 402(o)(1) prohibits (subject to exceptions in section 303(d)(4) and/or 402(o)(2)) the relaxation of effluent limitations for two situations:
- a. When a permittee seeks to revise a technology-based effluent limitation based on BPJ to reflect a subsequently promulgated effluent guideline which is less stringent; and,
 - b. When a permittee seeks relaxation of an effluent limitation which is based upon a changed State treatment standard or water quality standard.
- B. Section 402(o)(2) outlines specific exceptions to the general prohibition against establishment of less stringent effluent limitations. Codified in the NPDES regulations at 40 CFR 122.44(l), Section 402(o)(2) provided that the establishment of less stringent limitations may be allowed where:
- a. There have been material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility which justify this relaxation;
 - b. New information (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) is available that was not available at the time of permit issuance which would have justified a less stringent effluent limitation;
 - c. Technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of the law were made in issuing the permit under Section 402(a)(1)(b);
 - d. Good cause exists due to events beyond the permittee's control (e.g., acts of God) and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;

- e. The permit has been modified under certain specified sections of the CWA; or,
- f. The permittee has installed and properly operated and maintained required treatment facilities, but still has been unable to meet the permit limitations (relaxation may only be allowed to the treatment levels actually achieved).

Although the statute identified six exceptions where effluent limitations may be relaxed, the language specifically stated that exception “c” (as listed above) does not apply to water quality-based effluent limitations. Further, exception “e” as listed above only concerns sections of the CWA governing technology-based limitations. Thus, exceptions c & e would only apply to technology-based effluent limitations.

- C. Section 402(o)(3) prohibits the relaxation of effluent limitations in all cases if a revised effluent limitation would result in a violation of applicable effluent limitation guidelines or water quality standards, including antidegradation requirements. Thus, even if any of the antibacksliding exceptions outlined in either the statute or regulations are applicable, Section 402(o)(3) acts as a floor and restricts the extent to which effluent limitations may be relaxed. This requirement affirms existing provisions of the CWA that require limitations, standards, and conditions to ensure compliance with applicable technology-based limitations and water quality standards.

49. **Applicable Water Quality Objectives** – 40 CFR, Section 122.44(d)(vi)(A) requires the establishment of effluent limitations to attain and maintain applicable narrative water quality criteria to protect the designated beneficial use.

The Basin Plan includes narrative and numeric Water Quality Objectives (WQOs). The CTR promulgates numeric aquatic life criteria for 24 toxic pollutants and numeric human health criteria for 92 toxic pollutants. A compliance schedule provision in the CTR and the SIP authorizes the State to issue schedules of compliance for new or revised NPDES permit limitations based on the federal CTR criteria when certain conditions are met. CTR’s Compliance Schedule provisions sunsetted on May 18, 2005. After this date, the provisions of the SIP allow for Compliance Schedules not to exceed five years from issuance or past May 17, 2010, whichever ever is sooner. Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established in the Basin Plan, 40 CFR section 122.44(d) specifies that WQBELs may be set based on USEPA criteria and supplemented, where necessary, by other relevant information to attain and maintain narrative water quality criteria to fully protect designated beneficial uses.

50. **Types of Pollutants** – For CWA regulatory purposes, pollutants are grouped into three general categories under the NPDES program: conventional, toxic, and non-conventional. By definition, there are five conventional pollutants (listed in 40 CFR 401.16) – 5-day biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease. Toxic or “priority” pollutants are those defined in Section 307(a)(1) of the CWA (and listed in 40 CFR 401.12 and 40 CFR Part 423, Appendix A) and include heavy metals and organic compounds. Non-conventional pollutants are those which do not fall under either of the two previously described categories and include such parameters as ammonia, phosphorous, chemical oxygen demand, whole effluent toxicity, etc.

51. **Technology-Based Limitations for Municipal Facilities (POTWs)** – Technology-based effluent limitations require a minimum level of treatment for industrial/municipal point sources based on currently available treatment technologies while allowing the Discharger to use any available control techniques to meet the effluent limitations. The 1972 CWA required POTWs to meet performance requirements based on available wastewater treatment technology. Section 301 of the CWA established a required performance level—referred to as “secondary treatment”—that all POTWs were required to meet by July 1, 1977. More specifically, Section 301(b)(1)(B) of the CWA required that USEPA develop secondary treatment standards for POTWs as defined in Section 304(d)(1). Based on this statutory requirement, USEPA developed national secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 CFR Part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all POTWs and identify the minimum level of effluent quality to be attained by secondary treatment in terms of five-day biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, and pH.
52. **Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)** – Water quality-based effluent limitations are designed to protect the quality of the receiving water by ensuring that State water quality standards are met by discharges from an industrial/municipal point source. If, after technology-based effluent limitations are applied, a point source discharge will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable water quality criterion, then 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) requires that the permit contain a WQBEL. Although the CWA establishes explicit technology-based requirements for POTWs, Congress did not exempt POTWs from additional regulation to protect water quality standards. As a result, POTWs are also subject to WQBELs. This was upheld by the Appellate Court in *the City of Burbank, City of Los Angeles v. State Water Resources Control Board* case. Applicable water quality standards for the Los Angeles River are contained in the Basin Plan and CTR, as described in previous findings.
53. **Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations for Toxic Pollutants** – Toxic substances are regulated in this permit by water quality based effluent limitations derived from the 1994 Basin Plan, the CTR, and/or best professional judgment (BPJ) pursuant to Part 122.44. If a discharge causes, has a reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to a receiving water excursion above a narrative or numeric objective within a State water quality standard, federal law and regulations, as specified in 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), and in part, the SIP, require the establishment of WQBELs that will protect water quality. As documented in the fact sheet, pollutants exhibiting reasonable potential in the discharge, authorized in this Order, are identified in the Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) section and have final effluent limitations. Because ambient receiving water data is not available, reasonable potential was not triggered for some of the 126 priority pollutants and final limitations cannot be determined at this time. The Discharger is required to gather the appropriate data and the Regional Board will determine if final effluent limitations are needed. If final limitations are needed, the permit will be reopened and limitations will be included in the permit.
54. **Stringency Requirements for Individual Pollutants** – This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD and TSS. Restrictions on BOD and TSS are specified in federal regulations as discussed in findings. This

Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards.

This Order contains some pollutant restrictions that are more stringent than applicable federal requirements and standards. Specifically, this Order includes limitations for tetrachloroethylene, and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate that are more stringent than applicable federal standards, but that are nonetheless necessary to meet numeric objectives or protect the beneficial uses of both surface water (under the CWA) and groundwaters (under CWC). The rationale for including these limitations is explained in Section XII.2 of this Fact Sheet. In addition, the Regional Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241, as discussed in Section XII.3 of this Fact Sheet.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant water quality-based effluent limitations were derived from the California Toxics Rule, the California Toxics Rule is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on May 1, 2001. All designated beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "applicable water quality standards for purposes of the [Clean Water] Act" pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 131.21(c)(1). [The remaining water quality objectives (Basin Plan Amendments) implemented by this Order were subsequently approved by USEPA, and are applicable water quality standards pursuant to 40 C.F.R. 131.21(c)(2).] Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the technology-based requirements of the Clean Water Act and the applicable water quality standards for purposes of the Clean Water Act.

55. ***Basis for Effluent Limitations for 303(d) Listed Pollutants*** – For 303(d) listed pollutants, the Regional Board plans to develop and adopt total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) which will specify wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point sources and load allocations (LA) for non-point sources, as appropriate. Following the adoption of TMDLs by the Regional Board, NPDES permits will be issued, and where appropriate, reopened to include effluent limitations consistent with the assumptions of the TMDL, based on applicable WLAs. In the absence of a TMDL, the permits will include water quality-based effluent limitations derived as provided in the CTR and SIP (if applicable). These effluent limitations are based on criteria applied end-of-pipe due to no mixing zone or dilution credits allowed.
56. ***CWA 303(d) Listed Pollutants*** – On October 25, 2006, the State Board adopted a revised 303(d) list. The 2006 303(d) list was partially approved by the USEPA on November 30, 2006. However, on March 8, 2007, USEPA partially disapproved the State's 303(d) List, by disapproving the State's omission of impaired waters that met

federal listing regulations or guidance. USEPA added additional water bodies and additional pollutants for waters already listed by the State. On June 28, 2007, USEPA transmitted the final approved 2004-2006 Section 303(d) List, which serves as the State's most recent list of impaired water bodies. The list (hereinafter referred to as the 303(d) list) was prepared in accordance with Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act to identify specific impaired waterbodies where water quality standards are not expected to be met after implementation of technology-based effluent limitations on point sources.

Los Angeles River, Los Angeles River Estuary, and their tributaries are on the 303(d) List. The following pollutants/stressors, from point and non-point sources, were identified as impacting the receiving waters:

- A. Los Angeles River Reach 4 (Sepulveda Drive to Sepulveda Dam) – Hydrologic Unit 405.21: Coliform bacteria^A, ammonia^B, copper^B, lead^B, nutrients (algae)^B, and trash^B;
- B. Los Angeles River Reach 3 (Figueroa Street to Riverside Drive) – Hydrologic Unit 405.21: Ammonia^B, copper^B, lead^B, nutrients (algae)^B, and trash^B;
- C. Los Angeles River Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street) – Hydrologic Unit 405.15: Ammonia^B, coliform bacteria^A, copper^B, lead^B, nutrients (algae)^B, oil^A, and trash^B;
- D. Los Angeles River Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street) – Hydrologic Unit 405.12: Ammonia^B, cadmium^B, coliform bacteria^A, dissolved copper^B, cyanide^A, diazinon^A, lead^B, nutrients (algae)^B, trash^B, pH^B, and dissolved zinc^B; and,
- E. Los Angeles River Estuary (Queensway Bay) – Hydrologic Unit 405.12: Chlordane (sediment)^A, DDT (sediment)^A, Lead (sediment)^A, PCBs (sediment)^A, sediment toxicity^A, Zinc (sediment)^A, and trash^B.

The Regional Board adopted the 2008 303(d) list of impaired water bodies on July 16, 2009, and submitted the list to the State Board for approval.

57. **Relevant Total Maximum Daily Loads** – A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is a determination of the amount of a pollutant, from point, nonpoint, and natural background sources, including a margin of safety, which may be discharged to a water quality-limited water body. Section 303(d) of the CWA established the TMDL process. The statutory requirements are codified at 40 CFR, § 130.7. TMDLs must be developed for the pollutants of concern which impact the water quality of water bodies on the 303(d) list. According to the TMDL schedule, under the amended consent decree, *Heal the Bay, Santa Monica Bay Keeper, et al. v. Browner, et al.* (March 23, 1999), the trash, nitrogen, and metals TMDLs for the Los Angeles River must be completed by March 2001, March 2003, and March 2004, respectively. The coliform TMDL for Los Angeles Harbor is scheduled for completion by March 2006.

^A TMDL Requirement Status of A = Those requiring TMDLs

^B TMDL Requirement Status of B = Being addressed by USEPA approved TMDLs

- A. **Nitrogen Compounds TMDL** – On July 10, 2003, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 2003-009, *Amendment to the Basin Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Include a TMDL for Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects in the Los Angeles River (Nitrogen Compounds TMDL)*. On November 19, 2003, the State Board approved the *Nitrogen Compounds TMDL*. However, on December 4, 2003, the Regional Board revised the Nitrogen Compound TMDL by adopting Resolution No. 2003-016, *Revision of Interim Effluent Limitations for Ammonia in the Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Include a TMDL for Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects in the Los Angeles River*. Resolution No. 2003-016 only revised the portion of the Nitrogen Compounds TMDL containing interim limitations for total ammonia as nitrogen, for the Glendale and Tillman WRPs. All other portions of the TMDL remained unchanged. The *Nitrogen Compounds TMDL* went into effect on March 23, 2004, when the Regional Board filed the Notice of Decision with the California Resources Agency.
- B. **Trash TMDL** – On January 25, 2001, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 01-006. However, on September 19, 2001, the Regional Board reconsidered Resolution No. 01-006 and adopted Resolution No. 2001-013, *Amendment to the Basin Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a TMDL for Trash in the Los Angeles River (Trash TMDL)*, which supercedes Resolution No. 01-006. On February 19, 2002, the State Board adopted Resolution No. 02-038, approving the Regional Board's Trash TMDL.

The TMDL subsequently was approved by the State Water Quality Control Board on February 19, 2002 and by OAL on July 16, 2002. Since the State Board and OAL failed to approve the TMDL in time to meet the relevant federal consent decree, USEPA promulgated its own Trash TMDL. Upon approval of the regional Board's TMDL by OAL, USEPA approved the regional Board's LA River Trash TMDL on August 1, 2002, and deemed it to have superceded the TMDL promulgated by USEPA.

The City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles both filed petitions and complaints in the Los Angeles Superior Court challenging the LA River Trash TMDL. Subsequent negotiations led to a settlement agreement, which became effective on September 23, 2003. The Court of Appeal rejected the claims litigated by the cities, but found that the Water Board did not adequately complete the environmental checklist. The Court therefore affirmed a writ of mandate issued by the trial court, which orders the Water Board to set aside and not implement the TMDL until it has been brought into compliance with CEQA.

On June 6, the Regional Board set aside the TMDL and Resolution No. 01-013 which established it, pursuant to the writ of mandate. On June 28, 2006, a CEQA scoping meeting was conducted. Regional Board staff revised the CEQA checklist in response to comments received; prepared a Basin Plan Amendment to incorporate the LA River Trash TMDL; and, have scheduled the item for board adoption at the October 24, 2006 public hearing, which was cancelled. A new hearing schedule is not applicable.

- C. **Metals TMDL** – On June 2, 2005, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. R05-006, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load for Metals for the Los Angeles River and its Tributaries (LA River Metals TMDL)*. The LA River Metals TMDL contains Waste Load Allocations for cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc. Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) showed exceedances of water quality objectives in receiving water for copper and lead. Therefore, numeric water quality based effluent limitations have been prescribed for these metals in this permit. Cadmium and zinc did not show reasonable potential. However, consistent with the SIP Procedures and the TMDL WLAs, effluent limitations for these metals have been prescribed. On October 20, 2005, the State Board approved the *LA River Metals TMDL* by adopting Resolution No. 2005-0077. On December 9, 2005 and December 22, 2005, respectively, OAL and USEPA approved the *LA River Metals TMDL*. It went into effect on January 11, 2006, when the Certificate of Fee Exemption was filed with the California Department of Fish and Game.

On February 16, 2006, the Cities of Bellflower, Carson, Cerritos, Downey, Paramount, Santa Fe Springs, Signal Hill, and Whittier (Cities) filed a petition for a writ of mandate challenging many aspects of the Los Angeles River Metals TMDL and the Ballona Creek Metals TMDL. (*Cities of Bellflower et al v. SWRCB et al*, Los Angeles Superior Court No. BS101732) On May 24, 2007, the Los Angeles County Superior Court adopted the third of three rulings with respect to the writ petition. Collectively, all challenges to the TMDLs were rejected, except for one CEQA claim. The Court ruled that the State and Regional Boards (Water Boards) should have adopted and circulated an alternatives analysis that analyzed alternatives to the project. The Court issued its writ of mandate, directing the Water Boards to adopt an alternative analysis that analyzed feasible alternatives to the TMDLs, and to reconsider the TMDLs accordingly.

After considering the alternative analysis, the Regional Board found that the TMDL as originally proposed and adopted was appropriate. The Regional Board further found that nothing in the alternatives analysis nor any of the evidence generated, presents a basis for the Regional Board to conclude that it would have acted differently when it adopted the TMDLs had the alternative analysis been prepared and circulated at that time. Thus, on September 6, 2007, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. R2007-014, which reestablished the metals TMDL for the Los Angeles River in substantially its original form.

On May 7, 2009, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 09-003, which voided and set aside Resolution Nos. R05-006 and R05-007 as required by the writ of mandate in the matter of *Cities of Bellflower et al v. SWRCB*.

The numeric limitations are consistent with the WLAs and provisions of the TMDL. “EPA’s interpretation of 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B) is that available waste load allocations must be incorporated into corresponding permit effluent limitations, irrespective of reasonable potential.” It assigns wasteload allocations (a portion of the loading capacity of the **receiving water**) to each identified priority pollutant source of waste. Wasteload allocations for select metals in a TMDL were calculated

by taking the median hardness, referenced in the TMDL staff report, and adjusting the CTR chronic or acute criteria according to Section 1.4.1 and Appendix 3 of the SIP. These TMDL wasteload allocations were not expressed with averaging periods in the TMDL.

Therefore, NPDES permit writers must take the extra step of expressing the assigned wasteload allocations as WQBELs by using the calculation procedures in Section 1.4 of the SIP. This is consistent with the LA River Metals TMDL implementation element. Calculating end of pipe effluent limitations will ensure that the in-stream concentrations of each metal meet water quality standards.

58. **Mixing Zones, Water Effects Ratio (WER), Translators, and Dilution Credits** – Mixing zones, dilution credits, WER, and attenuation factors are not authorized in this Order except as consistent with those used in the determination of a wasteload allocation under an approved TMDL. Allowance of a mixing zone is in the Regional Board's discretion under Section 1.4.2 of the SIP and under the Basin Plan (Basin Plan Chapter 4, page 30). If the Discharger subsequently conducts appropriate mixing zone, WER, and dilution credit studies, the Regional Board can evaluate the propriety of granting a mixing zone or establishing dilution credits.

Water Effects Ratio – The City of Los Angeles, in conjunction with the City of Burbank, is pursuing two separate water effect ratio (WER) studies, one for copper and another for ammonia. Larry Walker Associates (LWA) has been hired by the cities to conduct both the LA River Copper WER Study and the LA River Ammonia WER, according to their respective approved workplans. Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) have been assembled to provide independent review of the proposed WERs. A memorandum dated June 20, 2006, written by LWA, addressed to the Copper WER TAC, presents the results of sampling conducted and recommends different WERs for various reaches of the LA River. Both WER studies have yet to be approved by the Regional Board. Although the results of the WER studies may not be incorporated into the corresponding TMDLs before the NPDES permit goes to the Board for revision, this permit contains a reopener which allows the modification of final effluent limitations, if at the conclusion of necessary studies conducted by the Cities, the Regional Board determines that dilution credits, attenuation factors, water effect ratios, or metal translators are warranted.

Dilution and Attenuation Factors – On July 16, 2003, the State Board adopted Order No. WQO 2003-0009, directing Regional Board staff to work with County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC), once data was provided, to determine whether dilution and attenuation are appropriate factors to consider in developing effluent limitations to protect the GWR beneficial use, in the Whittier Narrows WRP NPDES permit. However, this does not apply to the Tillman WRP at this time, because the City has not provided the necessary site-specific data or studies regarding the groundwater basins in the San Fernando Valley and the Central Los Angeles Coastal Plain Groundwater Basin areas.

At this time, the Regional Board has concluded that mixing zones, WER, and dilution credits would be inappropriate to grant, in light of the following factors:

- A. The Tillman WRP discharge contributes the largest flow into the Los Angeles watershed in the vicinity of the discharge point it overwhelms the receiving water providing limited mixing and dilution;
- B. Even in the absence of the Tillman WRP discharge, the receiving water primarily consists of nuisance flows and other effluents, limiting its ability to assimilate additional waste;
- C. Several reaches of the Los Angeles River including those subject to this Order are 303(d) listed (i.e., impaired) for certain constituents;
- D. Impaired waters do not have the capacity to assimilate pollutants of concern at concentrations greater than the applicable objective;
- E. For the protection of the beneficial uses is listed on Finding 37.
- F. Consistent with Antidegradation Policies;
- G. Because a mixing zone study has not been fully conducted; and,
- H. Because a hydrologic model of the discharge and the receiving water have not been conducted.
- I. Because the final WER study reports have not been approved by the Board.

Translators – Please see Finding No. 29. of this Order.

59. Specific effluent limitations for each constituent contained in this Order were developed in accordance with the foregoing laws, regulations, plans, policies, and guidance. The specific methodology and example calculations are documented in the Fact Sheet prepared by Regional Board staff that accompanies this Order.

REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

60. As specified in 40 CFR Part 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include limitations for all pollutants “which the Director (defined as the Regional Administrator, State Director, or authorized representative in 40 CFR Part 122.2) determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard.”
- A. Using the method described in the TSD, the Regional Board has conducted Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) for:
 - a. **Ammonia and other Nitrogen Species** – RPA was conducted for Ammonia, Nitrate plus Nitrite as Nitrogen, Nitrate Nitrogen, and Nitrite Nitrogen (Table A3 of the accompanying Fact Sheet) using the Discharger’s effluent data from their self monitoring reports. Ammonia Nitrogen, Nitrate plus Nitrite as Nitrogen, Nitrate Nitrogen, and Nitrite Nitrogen effluent data is summarized in Table A1 of

the accompanying Fact Sheet. Temperature and pH effluent data is summarized in Table A2 of the accompanying Fact Sheet. The RPA compares the effluent data with the Basin Plan water quality objectives (WQOs). The Discharger's projected effluent exceeded the Basin Plan WQOs for Ammonia, Nitrate plus Nitrite as Nitrogen, Nitrate Nitrogen, and Nitrite Nitrogen, during the last permit cycle. Based on this information, the Regional Board has determined that there is a reasonable potential that the discharge will cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan WQOs and, consistent with 40 CFR 122.44(d), the Order contains numeric effluent limitations for Ammonia, Nitrate plus Nitrite as Nitrogen, Nitrate Nitrogen, and Nitrite Nitrogen, based on the corresponding Basin Plan WQOs and TMDL Waste Load Allocations.

- b. **MBAS** – RPA was conducted for MBAS (Table A3 of the accompanying Fact Sheet) using the Discharger's effluent data from their self monitoring reports. MBAS is summarized in Table A1 of the accompanying Fact Sheet. The RPA compares the effluent data with the Basin Plan water quality objective (WQOs). The Discharger's projected effluent exceeded the Basin Plan WQOs for MBAS during the last permit cycle. Based on this information, the Regional Board has determined that there is a reasonable potential that the discharge will cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan WQOs and, consistent with 40 CFR 122.44(d), the Order contains a numeric effluent limitation for MBAS.
 - c. **Oil and Grease** – RPA was conducted for Oil and Grease (Table A3 of the accompanying Fact Sheet) using the Discharger's effluent data from their self monitoring reports. Oil and Grease is summarized in Table A1 of the accompanying Fact Sheet. The RPA compares the effluent data with the Basin Plan water quality objective (WQOs). The Discharger's projected effluent exceeded the Basin Plan WQOs for Oil and Grease during the last permit cycle. Based on this information, the Regional Board has determined that there is a reasonable potential that the discharge will cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan WQOs and, consistent with 40 CFR 122.44(d), the Order contains a numeric effluent limitation for Oil and Grease.
 - d. **Acute and Chronic Toxicity** – RPA was conducted for Acute Toxicity (Table A3 of the accompanying Fact Sheet) using the Discharger's effluent data from their self monitoring reports. Acute Toxicity is summarized in Table A1 of the accompanying Fact Sheet. The RPA compares the effluent data with the USEPA's water quality objective (WQOs). The Discharger's projected effluent exceeded the USEPA's WQOs for Acute Toxicity during the last permit cycle. Based on this information, the Regional Board has determined that there is a reasonable potential that the discharge will cause Acute Toxicity in the receiving water and, consistent with SIP section 4, the Order contains an effluent limitation for Acute Toxicity. As for Chronic Toxicity, there is no need to conduct RPA. Because Chronic Toxicity exceeded the 1.0 TUc trigger for the most of time and was as high as 16 TUc.
- B. Using the method described in the SIP, the Regional Board has conducted Reasonable Potential Analyses (RPA) using the discharger's effluent data contained

in Table A4. The RPA compares the effluent data with water quality objectives in the Basin Plan and CTR.

- a. **Reasonable Potential Determination** – The RPA (per the SIP) involves identifying the observed maximum pollutant concentration in the effluent (MEC) for each constituent based on the effluent concentration data. There are three tiers to determining reasonable potential. If any of the following three tiers is triggered, then reasonable potential exists:
 - i. For the first tier, the MEC is compared with the lowest applicable Water Quality Objective (WQO), which has been adjusted for pH, hardness and translator data, if appropriate. If the MEC is greater than the (adjusted) WQO, then there is reasonable potential for the constituent to cause or contribute to an excursion above the WQO and a water quality-based effluent limitation (WQBEL) is required. However, if the pollutant was not detected in any of the effluent samples and all of the reported detection limitations are greater than or equal to the WQO, proceed with Tier 2. The Regional Board exercised its discretion in identifying all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information in accordance with SIP Section 1.2 (Page 3).
 - ii. For the second tier, the observed maximum ambient background concentration (B) for the pollutant is compared with the adjusted WQO. If B is greater than the adjusted WQO and the pollutant was present in the effluent, then a WQBEL is required, because the effluent has reasonable potential to contribute to an exceedance of the WQO. The Regional Board exercised its discretion in identifying all available, applicable ambient background data in accordance with SIP Section 1.4.3 (Page 16).
 - iii. For the third tier, other information is used to determine RPA, such as the current CWA 303(d) List. Section 1.3 of the SIP describes the type of information that can be considered in Tier 3.

For all parameters that have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a WQO/criteria, numeric WQBELs are required. Section 1.4, Step 5 of the SIP (Page 8) states that MDELs shall be used for publicly-owned treatment works (POTWs) in place of average weekly limitations. WQBELs are based on CTR, USEPA water quality criteria, applicable TMDLs, and Basin Plan objectives (among which are the MCLs included by reference).

If the data are unavailable or insufficient to conduct the RPA for the pollutant, or if all reported detection limitations of the pollutant in the effluent are greater than or equal to the WQO, the Regional Board shall require additional monitoring, in accordance with Section 1.3. of the SIP.

A numerical limitation has not been prescribed for a toxic constituent if it has been determined that it has no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to

excursions of water quality standards. However, if the constituent had a limitation in the previous permit, and if none of the Antibacksliding exceptions apply, then the limitation will be retained. A narrative limitation to comply with all water quality objectives is provided in *Standard Provisions* for the priority pollutants, which have no available numeric criteria.

- b. **RPA Data** – The RPA conducted in 2006 was based on effluent monitoring data for January 1998 through November 2005. During the settlement negotiations preceding the January 25, 2010 settlement agreement, an updated RPA was conducted in February 2009, using available data that were representative of the treated effluent following the NDN upgrade and the ammonia add-back process change. Effluent monitoring data were collected between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2008 (see Table A6 of the Fact Sheet). In response to comments received, the dataset was expanded to include data from 2009; spreadsheets in the accompanying Fact Sheet were revised; and an updated reasonable potential analysis was conducted on March 3, 2010, yielding similar results. Effluent limitations for cyanide, tetrachloroethylene, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, and gamma-BHC are removed in this order for constituents that no longer have reasonable potential, as required by State Board Order WQ 2003-0009. Table A5 of the Fact Sheet summarizes the RPA, lists the constituents, and where available, the lowest, adjusted WQO, the MEC, the “Reasonable Potential” result, and the limitations from the previous permit.
 - i. **Metals Water Quality Objective** – For metals, the lowest applicable Water Quality Objective (WQO) was expressed as total recoverable, and where applicable, adjusted for hardness. Regional Board Staff used a hardness value of 246 mg/L, which is the value used in the calculation of the Metal TMDL for the Los Angeles River Watershed (Resolution No. R05-006 adopted on June 2, 2005), to convert the dissolved metal CTR criteria into the total recoverable metal form.
 - ii. **Interim Monitoring Requirements** – In accordance with the SIP, the Regional Board may impose interim monitoring requirements upon the Discharger, so that the Discharger obtains adequate ambient, background water data for priority pollutants upstream of the discharge point as well as suitable effluent data. On June 5, 2001 letter, the Executive Officer directed the Discharger to begin an interim monitoring program for the duration of 18 months, beginning July 2001. The Discharger collected samples on a monthly basis for all priority pollutants, with the exception of asbestos and 2,3,7,8-TCDD that were sampled semiannually, and reporting the results quarterly to the Regional Board. Section 1.3, Step 8, of the SIP authorizes the Regional Board to use the gathered data to conduct RPA, as outlined in Steps 1 through 7, and determine if a water quality-based effluent limitation is required.

A reopener provision is included in this Order that allows the permit to be reopened to allow the inclusion of new numeric limitations for any constituent

that exhibits reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedance of applicable water quality objectives.

- c. The numeric limitations contained in this Order are intended to protect and maintain existing and potential beneficial uses of the receiving waters. Environmental benefits provided by these limitations are reasonable and necessary.
 - d. Regional Board Staff have determined that copper, lead, mercury, and selenium, have a reasonable potential to exceed their respective CTR criteria, and, therefore, require CTR-based effluent limitations. Regional Board Staff also have determined that effluent limitations for cadmium, copper, lead, and zinc are consistent with the *Metal TMDL* implementation procedure.
61. This Order is consistent with State and Federal antidegradation policies in that it does not authorize a change in the quantity of wastewater discharged by the facility, nor does it authorize a change or relaxation in the manner or level of treatment. As a result, both the quantity and quality of the discharge are expected to remain the same consistent with antidegradation policies. The accompanying monitoring and reporting program requires continued data collection and if monitoring data show a reasonable potential for a constituent to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards, the permit will be reopened to incorporate appropriate WQBELs. Such an approach ensures that the discharge will adequately protect water quality standards for potential and existing uses and conforms with antidegradation policies and antibacksliding provisions.
62. ***Pollutant Minimization Program*** – The Discharger shall be required to develop a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP), in accordance with Section 2.4.5.1. of the SIP, when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation.

INTERIM REQUIREMENTS

63. ***Copper, Lead, Mercury, Selenium, and Gamma-BHC*** – Data submitted in previous self-monitoring reports indicated that these constituents have been detected in the effluent/receiving water, at least once, at a concentration greater than the limitations prescribed in this Order. The Tillman WRP, therefore, may not be able to achieve consistent compliance with the CTR-based final effluent limitation for these constituents. The City has the option to conduct studies to obtain the necessary data to develop site-specific objectives for mercury for human health from the consumption of fish and shellfish taken from the receiving waters, and copper and lead, for the aquatic life. Accordingly, the City shall prepare and submit a draft workplan to the Regional Board for review and approval, prior to implementing the study, if they have optioned to conduct the study. The interim limitations are not applicable for selenium and gamma-BHC, because their MECs are less than the proposed final effluent daily maximum.
64. 40 CFR section 131.38(e) provides conditions under which interim effluent limitations and compliance schedules may be issued, but the current Basin Plan does not allow inclusion of interim limitations and compliance schedules in NPDES permits for effluent limitations.

The SIP allows inclusion of interim limitations in NPDES permits for CTR-based priority pollutants. The CTR provides for a five-year maximum compliance schedule, while the SIP allows for longer, TMDL-based compliance schedule. However, the USEPA has yet to approve the longer compliance schedules. Therefore, this Order includes interim limitations and compliance schedules for CTR-based priority pollutants limitations for a maximum of five years, when the Discharger has been determined to have problems in meeting the new limitations. This Order also includes a reopener to allow the Regional Board to grant TMDL-based compliance schedules if the USEPA approves the longer compliance schedule provisions of the SIP. For new non-CTR-based limitations (ammonia nitrogen, nitrite nitrogen, and nitrite plus nitrate as nitrogen) prescribed in this Order based on Basin Plan's WQO, for which the Discharger will not be able to meet immediately, interim limitations and compliance dates for ammonia nitrogen, nitrite nitrogen, and nitrite plus nitrate as nitrogen are provided in this Order.

On January 30, 2003, the Regional Board adopted, Resolution No. 2003-001, *Resolution Amending the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate Language Authorizing Compliance Schedules in NPDES Permits*, which allows compliance schedules in NPDES permits for effluent limitations that implement new, revised or newly interpreted water quality standards, or for effluent limitations that implement TMDLs for new, revised or newly interpreted water quality standards. However, since the limitations for the above constituents are neither new nor newly interpreted water quality standards, the Basin Plan Amendment for compliance schedules does not apply to the Tillman WRP's discharge.

65. In conformance with the CTR and the relevant provisions of SIP Section 2.1, the Discharger has submitted documentation that diligent efforts have been made to quantify pollutant levels in the discharge and the sources of the pollutants entering the POTW. In addition, the Discharger already has in place a source control and pollutant minimization approach through its existing pollutant minimization strategies and through the pretreatment program. The duration of interim requirements established in this Order was developed in coordination with Regional Board staff and the Discharger, and the proposed schedule is as short as practicable. The five-year compliance schedule is based on the maximum allowable compliance schedule. However, the Discharger anticipates it will take longer than five years to achieve the final limitations.

CEQA AND NOTIFICATION

66. The action to adopt a NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §21100, et. seq.) in accordance with California Water Code §13389.
67. The Regional Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to renew waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.
68. The Regional Board, in a public hearing, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge and to the tentative requirements.

69. This Order shall serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit pursuant to Section 402 of the Federal Clean Water Act, or amendments thereto, and is effective 50 days (May 21, 2010) from the date of its adoption because of significant public comment, in accordance with federal law, provided the Regional Administrator, USEPA has no objections.
70. Pursuant to California Water Code Section 13320, any aggrieved party may seek review of this Order by filing a petition with the State Board. A petition must be sent to the State Water Resources Control Board, P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, California, 95812, within 30 days of adoption of the Order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the City of Los Angeles, as owner and operator of the Tillman Water Reclamation Plant, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

I. DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

1. Effluent Limitations

- A. Wastes discharged shall be limited to treated municipal and industrial wastewater only, as proposed in the ROWD.
- B. The discharge of an effluent with constituents in excess of the following limitations is prohibited:
- a. Conventional and nonconventional pollutants:

| Constituent | Units | Discharge Limitations | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Monthly Average ^[1] | Weekly Average ^[1] | Daily Maximum ^[2] |
| Settleable solids | ml/L | 0.1 | -- | 0.3 |
| Suspended solids | mg/L | 15 | 40 | 45 |
| | lbs/day ^[3] | 10,010 | 26,690 | 30,020 |
| Oil and Grease | mg/L | 10 | -- | 15 |
| | lbs/day ^[3] | 6,670 | -- | 10,010 |
| BOD _{5@20°C} | mg/L | 20 | 30 | 45 |
| | lbs/day ^[3] | 13,340 | 20,020 | 30,020 |
| Total residual chlorine | mg/L | -- | -- | 0.1 ^[4] |
| | lbs/day ^[3] | -- | -- | 66.8 |
| Total dissolved solids | mg/L | 950 | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day ^[3] | 633,840 | -- | -- |
| Chloride | mg/L | 190 ^[5] | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day ^[3] | 126,770 | -- | -- |
| Sulfate | mg/L | 300 | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day ^[3] | 200,160 | -- | -- |

| Constituent | Units | Discharge Limitations | | |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Monthly Average ^[1] | Weekly Average ^[1] | Daily Maximum ^[2] |
| Fluoride | mg/L | 2.0[6] | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day[3] | 1,330 | -- | -- |
| Detergents (as MBAS) | mg/L | 0.5 | -- | -- |
| | lbs/day[3] | 330 | -- | -- |
| Nitrate (as N) | mg/L | 7.2[7] | -- | -- |
| Nitrite (as N) | mg/L | 0.9[7] | -- | -- |
| Nitrate + Nitrite (as N) | mg/L | 7.2[7] | -- | -- |
| | mg/L | 8.0[8] | -- | -- |
| Total ammonia (as N) | mg/L | 1.4[7] | -- | 4.2[7] |
| | mg/L | 20.5[8] | -- | 24.7[8] |

Footnotes:

[1]. Average Monthly Discharge Limitation means the highest allowable average of daily discharge over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during that month divided by the number of days on which monitoring was performed.

Average Weekly Discharge Limitation means the highest allowable average of daily discharge over a calendar week, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during that week divided by the number of days on which monitoring was performed.

[2]. The daily maximum effluent concentration limitation shall apply to both flow weighted 24-hour composite samples and grab samples, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment T).

[3]. The mass emission rate limitations are based on the existing plant design flow rate of 80 mgd, and are calculated as follows: $\text{Flow(MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34$ (conversion factor) = lbs/day. During wet-weather storm events in which the flow exceeds the design capacity, the mass discharge rate limitations shall not apply, and concentration limitations will provide the only applicable effluent limitations.

[4]. Determination of compliance with the final effluent limitation 0.10 mg/L for total residual chlorine will be based solely on end of pipe grab samples.

[5]. In accordance with the Resolution 97-02, adopted by the Regional Board on January 27, 1997, the chloride limitation has been increased from 150 to 190 mg/L.

[6]. Based on Table 3-6 of the Basin Plan.

[7]. This is the waste load allocation (WLA), according to the *Nitrogen Compounds TMDL* Resolution No. 2003-009, adopted by the Regional Board on July 10, 2003. The WLA serves as the effluent limitation for the discharge. It became effective on March 23, 2004, after the USEPA approves the *Nitrogen Compounds TMDL*,

and after the Regional Board filed the Notice of Decision with the California Resources Agency. Note that the interim effluent limitations contained in the *Nitrogen Compounds TMDL* would apply to the City's discharge, because construction and start-up operations of the NDN facilities have not been completed until September 2007 (See Footnote [8] below).

- [8]. This is the interim limitation according to the Nitrogen TMDL Resolution No. 03-016, adopted by the Regional Board on December 4, 2003. This interim limitation automatically became effective March 23, 2004, when the USEPA approved the *Nitrogen TMDL* for the Los Angeles River and continues for the duration of the TMDL interim limitation provisions. This interim limitation is only available till September 30, 2007. On October 1, 2007, the limitation specified with Footnote [7] above shall be applied.

b. Toxic pollutants:

| CTR # ^[1] | Constituent | Units | Discharge Limitations ^[**] | |
|----------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | Monthly Average ^[2] | Daily Maximum |
| 4 | Cadmium ^[3, 4] (Wet weather) | µg/L | 4.1 ^[5, 6, 7] | 8.2 ^[5, 6, 7] |
| | | lbs/day ^[8] | 2.7 | 5.5 |
| 6 | Copper ^[3, 4, 9] (Dry and wet weather) | µg/L | 23 ^[6, 7, 11, a] | 34 ^[6, 7, 11, a] |
| | | lbs/day ^[8] | 15 | 23 |
| 7 | Lead ^[3, 4, 9] (Dry and wet weather) | µg/L | 7.3 ^[6, 7, 11] | 18 ^[6, 7, 11] |
| | | lbs/day ^[8] | 4.9 | 12 |
| 8 | Mercury ^[4, 9] | µg/L | 0.051 ^[10] | 0.12 ^[10] |
| | | lbs/day ^[8] | 0.034 | 0.080 |
| 10 | Selenium ^[4, 9, 12] | µg/L | 3.6 | 9.2 |
| | | lbs/day ^[8] | 2.4 | 6.1 |
| 13 | Zinc ^[3, 4] (Wet weather) | µg/L | 193 ^[5, 6, 7] | 257 ^[5, 6, 7] |
| | | lbs/day ^[8] | 129 | 171 |

Footnotes:

- [**]. For priority pollutants, Section 2.4.5 of CTR Compliance Determination, reads, "Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reported ML."
- [1]. This number corresponds to the compound number found in Table 1 of CTR. It is simply the order in which the 126 priority pollutants were listed in 40 CFR section 131.38 (b)(1).
- [2]. Average Monthly Discharge Limitation means the highest allowable average of daily discharge over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during that month divided by the number of days on which monitoring was performed.

- [3]. Hardness value of 246 mg/L from the Los Angeles River Metal TMDL was used to assess compliance with CTR criteria.
- [4]. Concentration expressed as total recoverable.
- [5]. This is consistent with the Metal TMDL implementation procedure.
- [6]. This is the **wet weather** waste load allocation (WLA), according to Resolution No. R2007-014, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load for Metals for the Los Angeles River*, adopted by the Regional Board on September 6, 2007, which superseded Resolution No. R05-006, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load for Metals for the Los Angeles River and its Tributaries (LA River Metals TMDL)*, adopted by the Regional Board on June 2, 2005. The Metals TMDL was approved by the State Board, with the adoption of Resolution No. 2008-0046. On October 14, 2008 and October 29, 2008, respectively, OAL and USEPA approved the *LA River Metals TMDL*. It went into effect on October 29, 2008. According to the LA River Metals TMDL, wet weather is “when the maximum daily flow in the River is equal to or greater than 500 cfs at the LA River Wardlow gage station.”
- [7]. This effluent limitation will not be in effect until January 11, 2011, according to the LA River Metals TMDL Implementation Section, and until that time the Discharger shall comply with the applicable interim effluent limitations established in I.1.1.a. below.
- [8]. The mass emission rate limitations are based on the plant design flow rate of 80 mgd, and are calculated as follows: $\text{Flow(MGD)} \times \text{Concentration } (\mu\text{g/L}) \times 0.00834$ (conversion factor) = lbs/day. During wet-weather storm events when flow exceeds the design capacity, the mass emission rate limitation shall not apply. Only the concentration limitations shall apply.
- [9]. This constituent shows reasonable potential.
- [10]. This CTR-based effluent limitation will not be in effect until May 18, 2010, and until that time the Discharger shall comply with the interim limitations established in I.1.1.a. below.
- [11]. This is the **dry weather** waste load allocation (WLA), according to Resolution No. R2007-014, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load for Metals for the Los Angeles River*, adopted by the Regional Board on September 6, 2007, which superseded Resolution No. R05-006, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load for Metals for the Los Angeles River and its Tributaries (LA River Metals TMDL)*, adopted by the Regional Board on June 2, 2005. The Metals TMDL was approved by the State Board, with the adoption of Resolution No. 2008-0046. On October 14, 2008 and October 29, 2008, respectively, OAL and USEPA approved the *LA River Metals TMDL*. It went into effect on October 29, 2008. According to the LA River Metals TMDL, dry weather is “when the maximum daily flow in the River is less than 500 cfs at the LA River Wardlow gage station.”

[12]. An interim limitation is not applicable for selenium because there was only one exceedance for selenium over 8 years.

[a]. This is consistent with the SIP and Metal TMDL implementation procedures. The monthly average and daily maximum were derived using the Site-Specific Translators of 0.74 (chronic) and 0.92 (acute), respectively. Detailed discussions and calculations are found in the Fact Sheet, section IX.17.D.

- C. The pH of wastes discharged shall at all times be within the range of 6.5 to 8.5.
- D. The effluent temperature shall not exceed 86°F, except as a result of external ambient temperature.
- E. Radioactivity of the wastes discharged shall not exceed the limitations specified in Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 5, Section 64443, CCR, or subsequent revisions.
- F. In accordance with 40 CFR, Parts 133.102(a)(3) and 133.102(b)(3), for BOD and total suspended solids, respectively, the monthly average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. Percent removal is defined as a percentage expression of the removal efficiency across a treatment plant for a given pollutant parameter, as determined from the monthly average values of the raw wastewater influent pollutant concentrations to the facility and the monthly average values of the effluent pollutant concentrations for a given time period.
- G. The wastes discharged to watercourses shall at all times be adequately disinfected. For the purpose of this requirement, the wastes shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of coliform organisms at some point in the treatment process does not exceed 2.2 per 100 milliliters, and the number of coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 milliliters in more than one sample within any 30-day period. The median value shall be determined from the bacteriological results of the last seven (7) days for which analysis has been completed. Samples shall be collected at a time when wastewater flow and characteristics are most demanding on treatment facilities and the disinfection processes.
- H. For 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) a daily average of 2 Nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs); and (b) 5 NTUs more than 5 percent of the time (72 minutes) during any 24 hour period.
- I. Interim Effluent Limitations
 - a. The Discharger shall comply immediately with the following interim effluent limitations for copper and lead until January 10, 2011 and for mercury until May 17, 2010. Thereafter, the Discharger shall comply with the final limitations specified in Section I.1.B.b. of this Order. The interim

effluent limitations were based upon effluent performance data, provided by the City, from January 1998 through November 2005, and the *Minitab* program.

| Constituent | Units | Monthly Average | Daily Maximum |
|------------------------|-------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Copper ^[1] | µg/L | 34 ^[3] | 47.3 ^[3] |
| Lead ^[2] | µg/L | -- | 20 ^[4] |
| Mercury ^[1] | µg/L | 0.22 ^[5] | 0.53 ^[5] |

Footnote:

- [1]. Effluent values are assumed to be normally distributed for data sets containing all detects and non-detects.
- [2]. Effluent values are assumed to be lognormally distributed for data sets containing all detects and non-detects.
- [3]. Interim effluent limitations of 34 and 38 µg/L were derived statistically at 95% percentile for monthly average and at the 99% percentile for the daily maximum (See Attachment IL). The MEC, 47.3 µg/L, is chosen as the interim daily maximum. Because the interim daily maximum, 38 µg/L, won't help improve the situation of violation.
- [4]. Interim effluent limitations of 5.1 and 7.6 µg/L were derived statistically at 95% percentile for monthly average and at the 99% percentile for the daily maximum (See Attachment IL). The MEC, 20 µg/L, is chosen as the interim daily maximum. Because the interim monthly average and daily maximum are less than the proposed final effluent monthly average (7.3 µg/L) and daily maximum (18 µg/L) and won't help improve the situation of violation.
- [5]. Interim effluent limitations of 0.22 and 0.27 µg/L were derived statistically at 95% percentile for monthly average and at the 99% percentile for the daily maximum (See Attachment IL). The MEC, 0.53 µg/L, is chosen as the interim daily maximum. Because the interim daily maximum, 0.27 µg/L, won't help improve the situation of violation.

b. The Discharger shall submit quarterly progress reports (January 15, April 15, July 15 and October 15) to describe the progress of studies and/or actions undertaken to reduce copper, lead, and mercury in the effluent, and to achieve compliance with the limitations in this Order by the above-mentioned deadlines. The next progress report shall be received at the Regional Board by July 15, 2010, for the April to June 2010 quarter.

J. To protect underlying ground water basins, pollutants shall not be present in the wastes discharged at levels that pose a threat to ground water quality.

K. Acute Toxicity Limitation:

- a. The acute toxicity of the effluent shall be such that: (i) the average survival in the undiluted effluent for any three (3) consecutive 96-hour static or continuous flow bioassay tests shall be at least 90%, and (ii) no single test producing less than 70% survival.
- b. If either of the above requirements (I.1.K.a.i or I.1.K.a.ii) is not met, the Discharger shall conduct six additional tests over a six-week period. The Discharger shall ensure that results of a failing acute toxicity test is received by the Discharger within 24 hours of completion of the test and the additional tests shall begin within 3 business days of receipt of the result. If the additional tests indicate compliance with acute toxicity limitation, the Discharger may resume regular testing. However, if the results of any two of the six accelerated tests are less than 90% survival, then the Discharger shall begin a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE). The TIE shall include all reasonable steps to identify the sources of toxicity. Once the sources are identified, the Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to reduce toxicity to meet the objective.
- c. If the initial test and any of the additional six acute toxicity bioassay tests results are less than 70% survival, the Discharger shall immediately implement Initial Investigation Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Workplan.
- d. The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) No. 5695.

L. Chronic Toxicity Limitation and Requirements:

- a. The chronic toxicity of the effluent shall be expressed and reported in toxic units, where:

$$TU_c = \frac{100}{NOEC}$$

The No Observable Effect Concentration (NOEC) is expressed as the maximum percent effluent concentration that causes no observable effect on test organisms, as determined by the results of a critical life stage toxicity test.

- b. Chronic toxicity of 100% effluent shall not exceed a monthly median trigger of 1.0 TU_c or a daily maximum trigger of 1.0 TU_c in a critical life stage test.
- c. If the chronic toxicity of the effluent exceeds the monthly median trigger of 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall immediately implement accelerated chronic

toxicity testing according to MRP No. 5695, Section VI.4.B.d. If any three out of the initial test and the six accelerated tests results exceed 1.0 TU_c, trigger, the Discharger shall initiate a TIE and implement the Initial Investigation TRE Workplan, as specified in the following section of this Order (Section I.1.M.).

- d. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity monitoring as specified in MRP No. 5695.

M. Preparation of an Initial Investigation TRE Workplan

The Discharger shall submit a detailed copy of the Discharger's initial investigation TRE workplan to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board for approval within 90 days of the effective date of this permit. The Discharger shall use USEPA manuals EPA/600/2-88/070 (industrial) or EPA/833B-99/002 (municipal) as guidance, or most current version. At a minimum, the TRE Work Plan must contain the provisions in Attachment C. This workplan shall describe the steps the Discharger intends to follow if toxicity is detected, and should include, at a minimum:

- a. A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that would be used to identify potential causes and sources of toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency;
- b. A description of the facility's methods of maximizing in-house treatment efficiency and good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in operation of the facility; and,
- c. If a TIE is necessary, an indication of the person who would conduct the TIEs (i.e., an in-house expert or an outside contractor). See MRP Section IV.4.D. for guidance manuals.

2. **Receiving Water Limitations for Surface Waters**

Receiving water limitations apply to direct discharge from the Tillman WRP (Discharge Serial Nos. 001, 002, 003, and 008) and discharges from the wildlife and recreation lakes (Lake Discharge serial Nos. 004, 005, 006, and 007).

- A. For waters designated with a warm freshwater habitat (WARM) beneficial use, the temperature of the receiving water at any time or place and within any given 24-hour period shall not be altered by more than 5⁰F above the natural temperature (or above 80⁰F if the ambient receiving water temperature is less than 60⁰F) due to the discharge of effluent at the receiving water station located downstream of the discharge. Natural conditions shall be determined on a case-by-case basis.
- B. The pH of inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.5 as a result of wastes discharged. Ambient pH levels shall not be

changed more than 0.5 units from natural conditions as a result of wastes discharged. Natural conditions shall be determined on a case-by-case basis.

- C. The dissolved oxygen in the receiving water shall not be depressed below 5 mg/L as a result of the wastes discharged.
- D. The fecal coliform concentration in the receiving water shall not exceed the following, as a result of wastes discharged:
 - a. Geometric Mean Limitations
 - i. E.coli density shall not exceed 126/100 mL.
 - ii. Fecal coliform density shall not exceed 200/100 mL.
 - b. Single Sample Limitations
 - i. E.coli density shall not exceed 235/100 mL.
 - ii. Fecal coliform density shall not exceed 400/100 mL.
- E. Waters shall be free of changes in turbidity that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. Increases in natural turbidity attributable to controllable water quality factors shall not exceed the following limitations, as a result of wastes discharged:
 - a. Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 50 NTU, increases shall not exceed 20%, and
 - b. Where natural turbidity is greater than 50 NTU, increases shall not exceed 10%.
- F. The wastes discharged shall not produce concentrations of toxic substances in the receiving water that are toxic to or cause detrimental physiological responses in human, animal, or aquatic life.
- G. The wastes discharged shall not contain radionuclides in concentrations that are deleterious to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life, or that result in accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that present a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
- H. The concentrations of toxic pollutants in the water column, sediments, or biota shall not adversely affect beneficial uses as a result of the wastes discharged.
- I. The wastes discharged shall not contain substances that result in increases in BOD, which adversely affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

- J. Waters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growth to the extent that such growth causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
- K. The wastes discharged shall not cause the receiving waters to contain any substance in concentrations that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.
- L. The wastes discharged shall not alter the natural taste, odor, and color of fish, shellfish, or other surface water resources used for human consumption.
- M. The wastes discharged shall not result in problems due to breeding of mosquitoes, gnats, black flies, midges, or other pests.
- N. The wastes discharged shall not result in visible floating particulates, foams, and oil and grease in the receiving waters.
- O. The wastes discharged shall not alter the color of the receiving waters; create a visual contrast with the natural appearance of the water; nor cause aesthetically undesirable discoloration of the receiving waters.
- P. The wastes discharged shall not contain any individual pesticide or combination of pesticides in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses of the receiving waters. There shall be no increase in pesticide concentrations found in bottom sediments or aquatic life as a result of the wastes discharged.
- Q. The wastes discharged shall not cause concentrations of contaminants to occur at levels that are harmful to human health in waters which are existing or potential sources of drinking water.
- R. Acute Toxicity Receiving Water Quality Objective
 - a. There shall be no acute toxicity in ambient waters as a result of wastes discharged.
 - b. Receiving water and effluent toxicity testing shall be performed on the same day as close to concurrently as possible.
 - c. The acute toxicity of the receiving water, at the station located immediately downstream of the discharge, which are R-2, R-7, (Stations R-2 need be sampled only if Discharge Serial No. 001 is used for discharge of effluent), and Stations D, F, H, I, J, K, W-C, W-D, and W-E, including mixing zone shall be such that: (i) the average survival in the undiluted receiving water for any three (3) consecutive 96-hour static, static-renewal*, or continuous flow bioassay tests shall be at least 90%, and (ii) no single test producing less than 70% survival.

- * Static-renewal bioassay tests may be used, as allowed by the most current USEPA test method, for measuring acute toxicity.

S. Chronic Toxicity Receiving Water Quality Objective

- a. There shall be no chronic toxicity in ambient waters as a result of wastes discharged.
- b. Receiving water and effluent toxicity testing shall be performed on the same day as close to concurrently as possible.
- c. If the chronic toxicity in the receiving water at the monitoring station immediately downstream of the discharge, exceeds the monthly median of 1.0 TU_c trigger in a critical life stage test and the toxicity cannot be attributed to upstream toxicity, as assessed by the Discharger, then the Discharger shall immediately implement an accelerated chronic toxicity testing according to Monitoring and Reporting Program CI 5695, section VI.4.B.d. If two of the six tests exceed a monthly median of 1.0 TU_c trigger, the Discharger shall initiate a TIE and implement the Initial Investigation TRE Workplan.
- d. If the chronic toxicity of the receiving water upstream of the discharge is greater than the downstream and the TU_c of the effluent chronic toxicity test is less than or equal to a monthly median of 1 TU_c trigger, then accelerated monitoring need not be implemented.

II. SLUDGE REQUIREMENTS

1. The Discharger shall comply with the requirements of 40 CFR, Part 503, in general, and in particular the requirements in Attachment B of this Order, [*Biosolids Use and Disposal Requirements*]. These requirements are enforceable by the USEPA.
2. The Discharger shall comply, if applicable, with the requirements in State issued statewide general Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No. 2000-10-DWQ, titled "General waste Discharge Requirements for the Discharge of Biosolids to Land for use as a soil Amendment in Agricultural, Silvicultural and Horticultural and Land Reclamation Activities" adopted in August 2000.
3. The Discharger shall comply, if applicable, with WDRs issued by other Regional Boards to which jurisdiction the Tillman WRP's biosolids are transported and applied.
4. The Discharger shall furnish this Regional Board with a copy of any report submitted to USEPA, State Board or other Regional Board with respect to municipal sludge or biosolids.

III. PRETREATMENT REQUIREMENTS

1. This Order includes the Discharger's approved Pretreatment Program as an enforceable condition. The Discharger is required to implement and enforce the pretreatment program in its entire service area, including the contributing jurisdictions.
2. The Discharger shall evaluate whether its pretreatment local limitations are adequate to meet the requirements of this Order. Tillman WRP is part of the Hyperion Treatment System, including LAGWRP, Burbank WRP, and Hyperion Treatment Plant. Some flows from the upstream plants are bypassed to the downstream plants for treatment. The evaluation of local limitations for the Tillman WRP cannot be done without consideration of the conditions at the other plants. In the reevaluation of the local limitations, the Discharger shall consider the effluent limitations contained in this Order, and other relevant factors due to the interconnectedness of the system and protection of all plants. Therefore, within 120 days of the effective date of this Order, the Discharger shall submit its plan and schedule for updating the local limitations, for approval of the Executive Officer.
3. Any substantial modifications to the approved Pretreatment Program, as defined in 40 CFR 403.18(b), shall be submitted in writing to the Regional Board and shall not become effective until Regional Board's approval is obtained.
4. The Discharger shall enforce the requirements promulgated under Sections 307(b), 307(c), 307(d), and 402(b) of the Federal Clean Water Act with timely, appropriate, and effective enforcement actions. The Discharger shall require industrial users to comply with Federal Categorical Standards and shall initiate enforcement actions against those users who do not comply with the standards. The Discharger shall require industrial users subject to the Federal Categorical Standards to achieve compliance no later than the date specified in those requirements or, in the case of a new industrial user, upon commencement of the discharge.
5. The Discharger shall perform the pretreatment functions as required in Federal Regulations 40 CFR, Part 403 including, but not limited to:
 - A. Implement the necessary legal authorities as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1);
 - B. Enforce the pretreatment requirements under 40 CFR 403.5 and 403.6;
 - C. Implement the programmatic functions as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2); and,
 - D. Provide the requisite funding and personnel to implement the Pretreatment Program as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(3).
6. The Discharger shall submit semiannual and annual reports to the Regional Board, and USEPA, Region 9, describing the Discharger's pretreatment activities over the period. The annual and semiannual reports (and quarterly reports, if required) shall contain, but not be limited to, the information required in the attached *Pretreatment Reporting*

Requirements (Attachment P), or an approved revised version thereof. If the Discharger is not in compliance with any conditions or requirements of this Order, the Discharger shall include the reasons for noncompliance and shall state how and when the Discharger will comply with such conditions and requirements.

7. The Discharger shall be responsible and liable for the performance of all control authority pretreatment requirements contained in 40 CFR, Part 403, including subsequent regulatory revisions thereof. Where Part 403 or subsequent revision places mandatory actions upon the Discharger as Control Authority but does not specify a timetable for completion of the actions, the Discharger shall complete the required actions within six months from the effective date of this Order or the effective date of Part 403 revisions, whichever comes later. For violations of pretreatment requirements, the Discharger shall be subject to enforcement actions, penalties, fines, and other remedies by the Regional Board, USEPA, or other appropriate parties, as provided in the Federal Clean Water Act. The Regional Board or USEPA may initiate enforcement action against an industrial user for noncompliance with acceptable standards and requirements as provided in the Federal Clean Water Act and/or the California Water Code.

IV. REQUIREMENTS AND PROVISIONS

1. Discharge of wastes to any point other than specifically described in this Order and permit is prohibited and constitutes a violation thereof.
2. The Discharger shall comply with all applicable effluent limitations, national standards of performance, toxic and pretreatment effluent standards, and all federal regulations established pursuant to Sections 208(b), 301, 302, 303(d), 304, 306, 307, 316, 403 and 405 of the Federal Clean Water Act and amendments thereto.
3. This Order includes the attached *Standard Provisions and General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements (Standard Provisions)* (Attachment N). If there is any conflict between provisions stated herein and the Standard Provisions, those provisions stated herein prevail. Conditions pertaining to bypass are contained in Standard Provisions sections B.13, B.20, and B.23, G.1. The bypass or overflow of untreated or partially treated wastewater to waters of the State is prohibited, except as allowed under conditions stated in 40 CFR section 122.41(m)(2), (m)(4) and (n). Consistent with those provisions, during periods of elevated, wet-weather flows, the operational diversion of secondarily treated wastewater around the tertiary filters is allowable provided that the combined discharge of fully treated and partially treated wastewater complies with the effluent and receiving water limitations in this Order.
4. This Order includes the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment T). If there is any conflict between provisions stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program and the "Standard Provisions" (Attachment N), those provisions stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program prevail.
5. Compliance Determination

- A. Compliance with single constituent effluent limitation – If the concentration of the pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reported Minimum Level (see Reporting Requirement III. 1. – III.5. of MRP), then the Discharger is out of compliance.
- B. Compliance with monthly average limitations - In determining compliance with monthly average limitations, the following provisions shall apply to all constituents:
 - a. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually, does not exceed the monthly average limitation for that constituent, the Discharger has demonstrated compliance with the monthly average limitation for that month.
 - b. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually, exceeds the monthly average limitation for any constituent, the Discharger shall collect four additional samples at approximately equal intervals. All five analytical results shall be reported in the monitoring report for that month, or the subsequent month.
 - c. When all sample results are greater than or equal to the reported Minimum Level (see Reporting Requirement III. 1. of M&RP), the numerical average of the analytical results of these five samples will be used for compliance determination.
 - d. When one or more sample results are reported as “Not-Detected (ND)” or “Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)” (see Reporting Requirement III. 4.B. of *M&RP*), the median value of these four samples shall be used for compliance determination. If one or both of the middle values is ND or DNQ, the median shall be the lower of the two middle values.
 - e. In the event of noncompliance with a monthly average effluent limitation, the sampling frequency for that constituent shall be increased to weekly and shall continue at this level until compliance with the monthly average effluent limitation has been demonstrated.
 - f. If only one sample was obtained for the month or more than a monthly period and the result does not exceed the monthly average, then the Discharger is in compliance with the monthly average limitation.
- C. Compliance with effluent limitations expressed as a sum of several constituents – If the sum of the individual pollutant concentrations is less than or equal to the effluent limitation, then the Discharger is in compliance. In calculating the sum of the concentrations of a group of pollutants, consider constituents reported as ND or DNQ to have concentrations equal to zero, provided that the applicable ML is used.

- D. Compliance with effluent limitations expressed as a median – in determining compliance with a median limitation, the analytical results in a set of data will be arranged in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order); and
- a. If the number of measurements (n) is odd, then the median will be calculated as $= X_{(n+1)/2}$, or
 - b. If the number of measurements (n) is even, then the median will be calculated as $= [X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1}]/2$, i.e. the midpoint between the n/2 and n/2+1 data points.

Consecutive exceedances of the coliform 7-day median effluent limitation, which take place within a calendar week and result from a single operational upset, shall be treated as a single violation.

- E. Compliance with the receiving water temperature limitation – If the receiving water temperature, downstream of the discharge, exceeds 86 °F as a result of:
- a. High temperature in the ambient air, or
 - b. High temperature in the receiving water upstream of the discharge, then the exceedance shall not be considered a violation.

6. In calculating mass emission rates from the monthly average concentrations, for compliance purpose, consider constituents reported as ND or DNQ to have concentrations equal to zero for the calculation of the monthly average concentration.

7. **Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

A. Spill Contingency Plan (SPC)

The Discharger shall maintain a SCP for the Tillman WRP and its sanitary sewage collection system in an up-to-date condition and shall amend the SCP whenever there is a change (e.g. in the design, construction, operation, or maintenance of the sewage system or sewage facilities) which materially affects the potential for spills. The Discharger shall review and amend the SCP as appropriate after each spill from the Tillman WRP or in the service area of the Facility. Upon request of the Regional Board, the Discharge shall submit the SCP and any amendments to the Regional Board. The Discharger shall ensure that the up-to-date SPC is readily available to the sewage system personnel at all times and that the sewage system personnel are familiar with it.

B. Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

The Discharger shall be required to develop a PMP as further described below when there is evidence (e.g., sample results reported as DNQ when the effluent limitation is less than the MDL, sample results from analytical methods

more sensitive than those methods required by this Order, presence of whole effluent toxicity, health advisories for fish consumption, results of benthic or aquatic organism tissue sampling) that a pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:

- a. The concentration of the pollutant is reported as DNQ and the effluent limitation is less than the reported ML; or,
- b. The concentration of the pollutant is reported as ND and the effluent limitation is less than the MDL.

The goal of the PMP shall to reduce all potential sources of a pollutant through pollutant minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures as appropriate, to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the effluent limitation. Pollution prevention measures may be particularly appropriate for persistent bioaccumulative priority pollutants where there is evidence that beneficial uses are being impacted. The Regional Board may consider cost-effectiveness when establishing the requirements of a PMP. The completion of a Pollution Prevention Plan, if required pursuant to CWC Section 13263.3(d), shall be considered to fulfill the PMP requirements.

The PMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions and submittals acceptable to the Regional Board:

- a. An annual review and semi-annual monitoring of potential sources of the reportable pollutant(s), which may include fish tissue monitoring and other bio-uptake sampling;
- b. Quarterly monitoring for the reportable pollutant(s) in the influent to the wastewater treatment system;
- c. Submittal of a control strategy designed to proceed toward the goal of maintaining concentrations of the reportable pollutant(s) in the effluent at or below the effluent limitation;
- d. Implementation of appropriate cost-effective control measures for the reportable pollutant(s), consistent with the control strategy; and,
- e. An annual status report that shall be sent to the Regional Board including:
 - i. All PMP monitoring results for the previous year;
 - ii. A list of potential sources of the reportable pollutant(s);
 - iii. A summary of all actions undertaken pursuant to the control strategy; and,
 - iv. A description of actions to be taken in the following year.

8. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specification

- A. Wastewater treatment facilities subject to this Order shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade pursuant to Chapter 3, Subchapter 14, Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (Section 13625 of the California Water Code).
- B. The Discharger shall maintain in good working order a sufficient alternate power source for operating the wastewater treatment and disposal facilities. All equipment shall be located to minimize failure due to moisture, liquid spray, flooding, and other physical phenomena. The alternate power source shall be designed to permit inspection and maintenance and shall provide for periodic testing. If such alternate power source is not in existence, the discharger shall halt, reduce, or otherwise control all discharges upon the reduction, loss, or failure of the primary source of power.

9. Spill Reporting Requirements

- A. The Discharger shall develop and maintain a record of all spills, overflows or bypasses of raw or partially treated sewage from its collection system or treatment plant. This record shall be made available to the Regional Board upon request and a spill summary shall be included in the annual summary report. The reports shall provide:
 - a. the date and time of each spill, overflow or bypass;
 - b. the location of each spill, overflow or bypass;
 - c. the estimated volume of each spill, overflow or bypass including gross volume, amount recovered and amount not recovered;
 - d. the cause of each spill, overflow or bypass;
 - e. whether each spill, overflow or bypass entered a receiving water and, if so, the name of the water body and whether it entered via storm drains or other man-made conveyances;
 - f. mitigation measures implemented; and,
 - g. corrective measures implemented or proposed to be implemented to prevent/minimize future occurrences.
- B. For certain spills, overflows and bypasses, the Discharger shall make reports and conduct monitoring as required below:
 - a. For any spills or overflows of any volume, discharged where they are, or will probably be discharged, to waters of the State, the Discharger shall

immediately notify the local health agency in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code section 5411.5.

- b. For spills, overflows or bypasses of any volume that flowed to receiving waters or entered a shallow ground water aquifer or has public exposure, the Discharger shall report such spills to the Regional Board, by telephone or electronically as soon as possible but not later than 24 hours of knowledge of the incident. The following information shall be included in the report: location; date and time of spill; volume and nature of the spill; cause(s) of the spill; mitigation measures implemented; and corrective measures implemented or proposed to be implemented to prevent/minimize future occurrences.
- c. For any spills or overflows of 1000 gallons or more discharged where they are, or probably will be discharged to waters of the State, the Discharger shall immediately notify the State Office of Emergency Services pursuant to Water Code section 13271.
- d. For spills, overflows or bypasses of any volume that reach receiving waters, the Discharger shall obtain and analyze grab samples for total and fecal coliforms or E. coli, and enterococcus, and relevant pollutants of concern, upstream and downstream of the point of entry of the spill (if feasible, accessible and safe) in order to define the geographical extent of impact of the spill. This monitoring shall be on a daily basis from time the spill is known until the results of two consecutive sets of bacteriological monitoring indicate the return to the background level or cessation of monitoring is authorized by the County Department of Health Services.
- e. For spills, overflows or bypasses of any volume that flowed to receiving waters or entered a shallow ground water aquifer, and all spills, overflows and bypasses of 1,000 gallons or more, the Discharger shall analyze a grab sample of the spill or overflow for total and fecal coliforms or E. coli, and enterococcus, and relevant pollutants of concern depending on the area and nature of spills or overflows if feasible, accessible and safe.
- f. The Regional Board notification shall be followed by a written preliminary report five working days after verbal notification of the incident. Within 30 days after submitting preliminary report, the Discharger shall submit the final written report to this Regional Board. (A copy of the final written report, for a given incident, already submitted pursuant to a Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Wastewater Collection System Agencies, may be submitted to the Regional Board to satisfy this requirement.) The written report shall document the information required in subparagraphs (b) and (d) above, monitoring results and any other information required in provisions of the Standard Provisions document. An extension for submittal of the final written report can be granted by the Executive Officer for just cause.

In addition, Regional Board expects that the municipal departments that have responsibilities to implement: (i) this NPDES permit, including pretreatment program, (ii) a MS4 NPDES permit that may contain spill prevention, sewer maintenance, reporting requirements and (iii) the SSO WDR will coordinate their compliance activities for consistency and efficiency.

Due to the fact that Hyperion Service Area sewer systems includes the inland plants of Tillman and Los Angeles-Glendale and their sewer systems, the spill requirements in present permit are consistent with the requirements in the Hyperion NPDES permit (CA0109991). The Permittee has the flexibility in managing its response to sanitary sewer overflows for the entire service area as long as the compliance with the requirements of the NPDES permits (pertaining to the Hyperion Service Area) provisions is assured.

10. The Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of pollutants from point sources to surface waters of the United States unless authorized under a NPDES permit. (33 U.S.C. §§1311, 1342). The State Board adopted General Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for Sanitary Sewer Systems, (WQ Order No. 2006-0003) on May 2, 2006, to provide a consistent, statewide regulatory approach to address Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs). The WDR requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems to develop and implement sewer system management plans and report all SSOs to the State Water Board's online SSO database.

The requirements contained in this Order in Sections IV.7.A, IV.8, and IV.9 are intended to be consistent with the requirements of the SSO WDR. The Regional Board recognizes that there may be some overlap between the NPDES permit provisions and SSO WDR requirements, at least as related to the collection systems. The requirements of the SSO WDR are considered the minimum thresholds (see Finding 11 of State Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ). To encourage efficiency, the Regional Board will accept the documentation prepared by the Permittees under the SSO WDR for compliance purposes, as satisfying the requirements in Sections IV.7.A, IV.8, and IV.9, provided the monitoring requirements contained in this Order in sections IV.9.B.d. and IV.9.B.e. are also addressed. Pursuant to the SSO WDR, State Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Section D., Provision 2.(iii) and (iv), the provisions of this NPDES permit supercede the SSO WDR, for all purposes, including enforcement, to the extent the requirements may be deemed duplicative.

11. The Discharger shall provide standby or emergency power facilities and/or storage capacity or other means so that in the event of plant upset or outage due to power failure or other cause, discharge of raw or inadequately treated sewage does not occur.
12. The Discharger shall protect the facility from inundation, which could occur as a result of a flood having a predicted frequency of once in 100 years.

13. The Discharger shall comply with all applicable water quality objectives for the receiving waters of the Los Angeles River, including the toxic criteria in 40 CFR, Part 131.36, as specified in this permit.
14. The Discharger may plan to conduct studies to obtain data in support of developing site-specific objectives for mercury and for the protection of human health from the consumption of fish and shellfish;; and lead, or selenium for the protection of aquatic life. If the Discharger chooses to conduct such studies, then they shall submit to Regional Board staff a detailed work plan for these studies. The work plan shall provide a schedule consistent with Effluent Limitation I.1.1.a for development and adoption of site-specific objectives for these constituents.

V. REOPENERS AND MODIFICATIONS

1. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with SIP section 2.2.2.A to incorporate the results of revised reasonable potential analyses to be conducted upon receipt of additional data from the interim monitoring program.
2. This Order may be modified, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR, Parts 122 and 124 to include requirements for the implementation of the watershed protection management approach.
3. The Board may modify, or revoke and reissue this Order if present or future investigations demonstrate that the discharge(s) governed by this Order will cause, have the potential to cause, or will contribute to adverse impacts on water quality and/or beneficial uses of the receiving waters.
4. This Order may also be modified, revoked, and reissued or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR Parts 122.44, 122.62 to 122.64, 125.62, and 125.64. Causes for taking such actions include, but are not limited to, failure to comply with any condition of this Order, endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity, or acquisition of newly obtained information which would have justified the application of different conditions if known at the time of Order adoption. The filing of a request by the District for an Order modification, revocation and issuance or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any condition of this Order.
5. This Order may be modified, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR, Parts 122 to 124, to include new MLs.
6. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise effluent limitations as a result of future Basin Plan Amendments, such as an update of a water quality objective, or the adoption of a TMDL for the Los Angeles River Watershed.
7. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise effluent limitations as a result of the delisting of a pollutant from the 303(d) list.

8. This Order may be reopened and modified to revise the chronic toxicity effluent limitation, to the extent necessary, to be consistent with State Board precedential decisions, new policies, new laws, or new regulations.
9. This Order may be reopened to modify final effluent limitations, if at the conclusion of necessary studies conducted by the Discharger, the Regional Board determines that dilution credits, attenuation factors, water effects ratio, or metal translators are warranted.

VI. EXPIRATION DATE

This Order expires on November 10, 2011.

The Discharger must file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with Title 23, California Code of Regulations, not later than 180 days in advance of such date as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements.

VII. RESCISSION

Order No. 98-046, adopted by this Regional Board on June 15, 1998, was superseded upon the effective date of Order No. R4-2006-0091, except for enforcement purposes. To the extent any provisions, limitations, or requirements set forth in this Order that supercede analogous provisions, limitations, or requirements in Order No. 98-046, are stayed or deemed to be unenforceable, the relevant provisions, limitations, or requirements of Order 98-046 shall remain enforceable.

I, Tracy J. Egoscue, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, on April 1, 2010.



Tracy J. Egoscue
Executive Officer

/DTSAl/