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

ORDER NO. R4-2003-0119
NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0064025

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM PERMIT
AND
WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
CRC INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED
(Formerly Sta-Lube, Incorporated)

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

Background

1. CRC Industries, Incorporated (hereinafter CRC or Discharger) discharges treated ground water under waste discharge requirements (WDRs) contained in Order No. 96-089 (NPDES No. CA0064025) adopted by the Regional Board on December 9, 1996, CI-7742. Order No. 96-089 expired on November 10, 2001.

2. CRC filed a report of waste discharge on February 11, 2003 and has applied for renewal of its WDRs and NPDES permit for discharge of wastes to surface waters. The tentative Order is the reissuance of the WDRs and NPDES permit for discharges from CRC.

Purpose of Order

3. The purpose of this Order is to renew the WDRs for the CRC facility. This NPDES permit regulates the discharge of treated ground water and storm water through Discharge Serial No. 001, to a storm drain that conveys the treated ground water to Compton Creek, a water of the United States. The point of discharge of treated ground water is located at Latitude 33°51'45", Longitude 118°12'30".

Facility Description

4. Sta-Lube, Incorporated (Sta-Lube) owned and operated a facility for the custom blending and distribution of hand cleaners, greases, and petroleum-based lubricants, located at 3039 Ana Street, Rancho Dominguez. CRC purchased Sta-Lube in 1993 and continued operations until 1998. The site is currently leased to a trucking and warehousing company, and the only activities on-site related to CRC (formerly Sta-Lube) are ground water treatment operations. Figure 1 shows the facility location map.

5. Operations at the former Sta-Lube facility included blending and packaging of hand cleaners, greases, and lubricants. Soil and ground water pollution resulted from leaking underground solvent storage tanks while the Sta-Lube facility was in operation. Solvents detected included acetone, benzene, chloroform, 1,1-dichloroethane, 1,1-dichloroethylene, 1,2-dichloroethylene, methylene chloride, methyl ethyl ketone, and toluene. All leaking underground storage tanks and associated piping have been removed.

6. The facility has operated a remediation treatment system for the removal of solvents from soils and ground water since June 1998. The original treatment system included a soil vapor extraction system and a ground water treatment system. The target lifespan for the remediation project was 5 years.

7. The facility removed the vapor extraction system, and in November 2002 completed a large diameter auger extraction project to remove the remaining contaminated soils. Prior to that time, the pollutant influent concentrations had reached very low levels and the cumulative mass removals were asymptotic. The soil vapor extraction system consisted of extracting solvent vapors from the contaminated soils through vapor extraction wells and treatment of the extracted solvent vapor by regenerable vapor-phase resin beds.

Discharge Description

8. The ground water is pumped from two monitoring wells (1A and 9A) to a treatment train consisting of a bag filter for particulate removal and two granular activated carbon units that are operated in series. The treated ground water effluent is then directed through Discharge Serial No. 001. Storm water that collects within the site is directed to a sump, and then is processed through the same ground water filtration system and is also discharged through Discharge Serial No. 001. Figure 2 shows the water flow diagram for the CRC facility.

9. CRC treats the contaminated ground water and discharges up to 144,000 gallons per day (gpd) of treated ground water and storm water through Discharge Serial No. 001 to a local storm drain that conveys the wastewater to Compton Creek, a water of the United States. The waste discharge flows approximately 3 miles in Compton Creek to the Los Angeles River, and then ultimately to the Los Angeles River Estuary.

Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations

10. On June 13, 1994, the Regional Board adopted a revised *Water Quality Control Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties* (Basin Plan) as amended on January 27, 1997 by Regional Board Resolution No. 97-02. The Basin Plan (i) designates beneficial uses for surface and groundwaters, (ii) sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated beneficial uses and conform to the state antidegradation policy (*Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California*, State Board Resolution No. 68-16, October 28, 1968), and (iii) describes implementation programs to protect all waters in the Region. In addition, the Basin Plan incorporates (by reference) applicable State and Regional Board plans and policies and other pertinent water quality policies and regulations. The Regional Board prepared the 1994 update of the Basin Plan to be consistent with all

previously adopted State and Regional Board plans and policies. This Order implements the plans, policies and provisions of the Regional Board's Basin Plan.

11. The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives and beneficial uses for inland surface waters and for the Pacific Ocean. Inland surface waters consist of rivers, streams, lakes, reservoirs, and inland wetlands. Beneficial uses for a surface water can be designated, whether or not they have been attained on a waterbody, in order to implement either federal or state mandates and goals (such as fishable and swimmable for regional waters).

12. The receiving waters for the permitted discharge covered by this permit is a storm drain that conveys wastewater to Compton Creek. The beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan for Compton Creek are:

    Compton Creek – Hydro Unit No. 405.15

    Existing: ground water recharge, contact and non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater habitat wildlife habitat, wetlands habitat.

    Potential: municipal and domestic water supply.

13. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan for Control of Temperature in the Coastal and Interstate Water and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* (Thermal Plan) on May 18, 1972, and amended this plan on September 18, 1975. This plan contains temperature objectives for inland surface waters.

14. On May 18, 2000, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) promulgated numeric criteria for priority pollutants for the State of California [known as the *California Toxics Rule* (CTR) and codified as 40 CFR 131.38]. In the CTR, USEPA promulgated criteria that protect the general population at an incremental cancer risk level of one in a million (10^{-6}), for all priority toxic pollutants regulated as carcinogens. The CTR also provides a schedule of compliance not to exceed 5 years from the date of permit issuance for a point source discharge if the Discharger demonstrates that it is infeasible to promptly comply with the CTR criteria.

15. On March 2, 2000, the State Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP*).* The SIP was effective on April 28, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the National Toxics Rule (NTR), and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Boards in their basin plans, with the exception of the provision on alternate test procedures for individual discharges that have been approved by the USEPA Regional Administrator. The alternate test procedures provision was effective on May 22, 2000. The SIP was effective on May 18, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The SIP requires the dischargers' submittal of data sufficient to conduct the determination of priority pollutants requiring water quality-based effluent limits (WQBELs) and to calculate the effluent limitations. The CTR criteria for fresh water or human health for consumption of organisms, whichever is more stringent, are used to develop the effluent limitations in this Order to protect the beneficial

uses of Compton Creek.

16. Under 40 CFR 122.44(d), Water Quality Standards and State Requirements, "Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, non-conventional, or toxic pollutants), which the Director [permitting authority] 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, including State narrative criteria for water quality." Where numeric effluent limitations for a pollutant or pollutant parameter have not been established in the applicable state water quality control plan, 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi) specifies that WQBELs may be set based on USEPA criteria, and may be supplemented where necessary by other relevant information to attain and maintain narrative water quality criteria, and to fully protect designated beneficial uses.

17. Effluent limitation guidelines requiring the application of best practicable control technology currently available (BPT), best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT), and best available technology economically achievable (BAT), were promulgated by the USEPA for some pollutants in this discharge. Effluent limitations for pollutants not subject to the USEPA effluent limitation guidelines are based on one of the following: best professional judgment (BPJ) of BPT, BCT or BAT; current plant performance; or WQBELs. The WQBELs are based on the Basin Plan, other State plans and policies, or USEPA water quality criteria which are taken from the CTR. These requirements, as they are met, will protect and maintain existing beneficial uses of the receiving water. The attached fact sheet for this Order includes specific bases for the effluent limitations.

18. 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(1) requires that except under certain conditions, all permit limits, standards, or prohibitions be expressed in terms of mass units. 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(2) allows the permit writer, at his its discretion, to express limits in additional units (e.g., concentration units). The regulations mandate that, where limits are expressed in more than one unit, the permittee must comply with both.

    Generally, mass-based limits ensure that proper treatment, and not dilution is employed to comply with the final effluent concentration limits. Concentration-based effluent limits, 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 limits, 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 limits. To account for this, this permit includes mass and concentration limits for some constituents.

19. State and Federal antibacksliding and antidegradation policies require Regional Board actions to protect the water quality of a water body and to ensure that the waterbody will not be further degraded. The antibacksliding provisions are specified in section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and in Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR), section 122.44(l). Those provisions require a reissued permit to be as stringent as the previous permit with some exceptions where effluent limitations may be relaxed.

20. Effluent limitations are established in accordance with sections 301, 304, 306, and 307 of the CWA, and amendments thereto. These requirements, as they are met, will maintain and protect the beneficial uses of the Compton Creek.

Watershed Management Approach and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

21. The Regional Board has implemented the Watershed Management Approach to address water quality issues in the region. Watershed management may include diverse issues as defined by stakeholders to identify comprehensive solutions to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore water quality and beneficial uses. To achieve this goal, the Watershed Management Approach integrates the Regional Board's many diverse programs, particularly Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), to better assess cumulative impacts of pollutants from all point and non-point sources. A TMDL is a tool for implementing water quality standards and is based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions. The TMDL establishes the allowable loadings or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody and thereby provides the basis to establish water quality-based controls. These controls should provide the pollution reduction necessary for a waterbody to meet water quality standards. This process facilitates the development of watershed-specific solutions that balance the environmental and economic impacts within the watershed. The TMDLs will establish waste load allocation (WLAs) and load allocations (LAs) for point and non-point sources, and will result in achieving water quality standards for the waterbody.

22. The 1998 303(d) List classifies Compton Creek as impaired. The pollutants of concern, detected in the water column, in the sediment, and in fish tissue, include copper, lead, high coliform count, and pH.

Data Availability and Reasonable Potential Monitoring

23. 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i) and (ii) require that each toxic pollutant be analyzed with respect to its reasonable potential to (1) cause; (2) have the reasonable potential to cause; or (3) contribute to the exceedance of a receiving water quality objective. This is done by performing a reasonable potential analysis (RPA) for each pollutant.

24. Section 1.3 of the SIP requires that a limit be imposed for a toxic pollutant if (1) the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) is greater than the most stringent CTR criteria, or (2) the background concentration is greater than the CTR criteria, or (3) other information is available. Sufficient effluent data are needed for this analysis.

25. Regional Board staff has determined that pollutants that have effluent limits in the current permit will be included in this permit. Certain effluent limitations have been established based on the revised water quality criteria contained in the CTR and the requirements contained in Section 1.4 of the SIP. This permit also includes requirements for additional monitoring to provide the data needed to complete an RPA on all of the priority pollutants.

26. A partial RPA was completed using the data collected at the site for the period October 2001 through December 2002 to determine if any of the constituents sampled previously at the site had a positive RPA. Based on the RPA, there was reasonable potential to

exceed water quality standards for copper, lead, zinc, methylene chloride, aldrin, alpha-BHC, 4,4'-DDT, 4,4'-DDE, 4,4'-DDD, dieldrin, heptachlor, and heptachlor epoxide. The RPA indicated that five constituents; aldrin, 4,4'-DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor, and heptachlor epoxide, have the potential to exceed the WQBELs.

Compliance Schedules and Interim Limitations

27. CRC may not be able to achieve immediate compliance with the WQBELs for aldrin, 4,4'-DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor, and heptachlor epoxide in Section I.B.4. of this Order. Data submitted in self-monitoring reports indicate that these constituents have been detected at concentrations greater than the new limit proposed in this Order. The Discharger may not be able to achieve immediate compliance with an effluent limitation based on CTR criterion for these constituents.

28. 40 CFR 131.38(e) provides conditions under which interim effluent limits and compliance schedules may be issued. The CTR and SIP allow inclusion of an interim limit with a specific compliance schedule included in a NPDES permit for priority pollutants if the limit for the priority pollutant is CTR-based. Interim limits have been included in this Order for aldrin, 4,4'-DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor, and heptachlor epoxide.

29. The SIP requires that the Regional Board establish other interim requirements, such as requiring the discharger to develop a pollutant minimization plan and/or source control measures, and participate in the activities necessary to develop final effluent limitations. When interim requirements have been completed, the Regional Board shall calculate final WQBELs for that pollutant based on the collected data, reopen the permit, and include the final effluent limitations in the permit provisions.

CEQA and Notifications

30. The Regional Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to issue waste discharge requirements for this discharge, and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.

31. The Regional Board, in a public hearing, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge and to the tentative requirements.

32. 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 shall take effect in accordance with federal law, provided the Regional Administrator, USEPA, has no objections.

33. 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, Office of Chief Counsel, ATTN: Elizabeth Miller Jennings, Senior Staff Counsel, 1001 I Street, 22nd Floor, Sacramento, California, 95814, within 30 days of adoption of this Order.

34. The issuance of waste discharge requirements for this discharge is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code (CEQA) in accordance with the California Water Code, section 13389.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that CRC Industries, Incorporated, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted there under, and the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted there under, shall comply with the following:

I. DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. Wastes discharged shall be limited to a maximum of 144,000 gallons per day (gpd) of treated ground water and storm water.

2. Discharges of water, materials, thermal wastes, elevated temperature wastes, toxic wastes, deleterious substances, or wastes other than those authorized by this Order, to a storm drain system, Compton Creek, or waters of the State, are prohibited.

B. Effluent Limitations

The discharge of an effluent in excess of the following limitations is prohibited:

1. A pH value less than 6.5 or greater than 8.5.

2. A temperature greater than 100° F.

3. Toxicity limitations:

a. Acute Toxicity Limitation and Requirements

i. 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.

ii. If any acute toxicity bioassay test result is less than 90% survival, the Discharger shall conduct six additional tests over a six-week period. The Discharger shall ensure that they receive results of a failing acute toxicity test within 24 hours of the completion of the test, and the additional tests shall begin within 3 business days of the 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 source(s) of toxicity. Once the source(s) of toxicity is identified, the Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to reduce the toxicity to meet the objective.

iii. If any two out of the initial test and the additional six acute toxicity bioassay tests result in less than 70% survival, including the initial test, the Discharger shall immediately begin a TIE.

iv. The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 7742.

b. Chronic Toxicity Limitation and Requirements

i. This Order includes a chronic testing toxicity trigger defined as an exceedance of 1.0 TU_c in a critical life stage test for 100% effluent. (The monthly median for chronic toxicity of 100% effluent shall not exceed, 1 TU_c in a critical life stage test.)

ii. If the chronic toxicity of the effluent exceeds 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall immediately implement accelerated chronic toxicity testing according to Monitoring and Reporting Program 7742, Item IV.B.1. If the results of two of the six accelerated tests exceed 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall initiate a TIE and implement the Initial investigation TRE Workplan.

iii. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 7742.

iv. 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.

v. Preparation of an Initial Investigation TRE Workplan

aa. The Discharger shall submit a copy of the Discharger's initial investigation Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) workplan (1-2 pages) to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board for approval within 90 days of the effective date of this permit. If the Regional Board Executive Officer does not disapprove the workplan within 60 days, the workplan shall become effective. The Discharger shall use EPA manuals EPA/600/2-88/070

(industrial) or EPA/833B-99/002 (municipal) as guidance. This workplan shall describe the steps the Discharger intends to follow if toxicity is detected, and should include, at a minimum:

ab. 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;

ac. 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,

ad. 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.E.3. for guidance manuals.)

4. Final effluent limitations: In addition to the Requirements I.B.1 through I.B.3, the discharge of treated ground water and storm water from Discharge Serial No. 001 containing constituents in excess of the following limitations is prohibited:

Constituents	Units	Maximum Daily Discharge Limitations		Average Monthly Discharge Limitations	
		Concentration	Mass[1] (lbs/day)	Concentration	Mass[1] (lbs/day)
pH	s.u.	Between 6.5 – 8.5	--	Between 6.5 – 8.5	--
BOD_5 @ 20°C	mg/L	30	36	20	24
Oil and grease	mg/L	15	18	10	12
Total suspended solids	mg/L	75	90	50	60
Settleable solids	ml/L	0.2	--	0.1	--
Turbidity	NTU	75	--	50	--
Benzene	µg/L	5.9	0.007	2.94	0.004
Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane)	µg/L	450	0.54	224	0.27
Copper[2]	µg/L	12.5	0.02	6.23	0.008
Lead[2]	µg/L	4.50	0.005	2.24	0.003
Zinc[2]	µg/L	109	0.13	54	0.06
Aldrin[3]	µg/L	0.0003	0.0000003	0.0001	0.0000001
alpha-BHC	µg/L	0.026	0.00003	0.013	0.00002
4,4'-DDT [3]	µg/L	0.001	0.000001	0.0006	0.0000007
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	0.001	0.000001	0.0006	0.0000007
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	0.002	0.000002	0.0008	0.000001
Dieldrin[3]	µg/L	0.0003	0.0000003	0.0001	0.0000002
Heptachlor[3]	µg/L	0.0004	0.0000005	0.0002	0.0000002
Heptachlor epoxide[3]	µg/L	0.0002	0.0000002	0.0001	0.0000001

[1] The mass-based effluent limitations for pollutants are based on a maximum discharge flow rate of 144,000 gpd.

The equation used to calculate the mass is:

m = 8.34 * C * Q where:

m = mass limit for a pollutant in lbs/day

C = concentration limit for a pollutant, mg/L
Q = maximum discharge flow rate, mgd

[2] Discharge limitations for these metals are expressed as total recoverable.

[3] The interim limits in Section I.B.5 below are applicable from the date of adoption of the Order through September 30, 2005.

5. Interim Effluent Limitations. From the effective date of this Order until September 30, 2005 the discharge of treated ground water and storm water from Discharge Serial No. 001 in excess of the following limitations is prohibited:

Constituents	Discharge Limitations (Maximum Daily)	
	Concentration (µg/L)	Mass[1] (lbs/day)
Aldrin	0.02	0.00002
4,4'-DDT	0.046	0.00006
Dieldrin	0.022	0.00003
Heptachlor	0.019	0.00002
Heptachlor Epoxide	0.012	0.00001

[1] The mass-based effluent limitations are based on a flow rate of 144,000 gpd.

Discharges after September 30, 2005 must comply with the limits for these constituents stipulated in the table in section I.B.4.

C. Receiving Water Limitations

1. The discharge shall not cause the following conditions to exist in the receiving waters:

   a. Floating, suspended or deposited macroscopic particulate matter or foam;

   b. Alteration of temperature, turbidity, or apparent color beyond present natural background levels;

   c. Visible, floating, suspended or deposited oil or other products of petroleum origin;

   d. Bottom deposits or aquatic growths; or,

   e. Toxic or other deleterious substances to be present in concentrations or quantities which cause deleterious effects on aquatic biota, wildlife, or waterfowl or render any of these unfit for human consumption either at levels created in the receiving waters or as a result of biological concentration.

2. The discharge shall not cause nuisance, or adversely effect beneficial uses of the receiving water.

3. No discharge shall cause a surface water temperature rise greater than $5^{o}F$ above the natural temperature of the receiving waters at any time or place.

4. The discharge shall not cause the following limitations to be exceeded in the receiving waters at any place within the waterbody of the receiving waters:

   a. The pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5, nor caused to vary from normal ambient pH levels by more than 0.5 units;

   b. Dissolved oxygen shall not be less than 5.0 mg/L anytime, and the median dissolved oxygen concentration for any three consecutive months shall not be less than 80 percent of the dissolved oxygen content at saturation;

   c. Dissolved sulfide shall not be greater than 0.1 mg/L;

   d. Total ammonia (as N) shall not exceed concentrations specified in the Basin Plan (June 13, 1994, Attachment H).

   e. The discharge shall not cause a violation of any applicable water quality standards for receiving waters adopted by the Regional Board or State Board. If more stringent applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to Section 303 of the Clean Water Act, or amendments thereto, the Regional Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such standards.

II. REQUIREMENTS

A. The Discharger shall submit within 90 days of the effective date of this Order:

1. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that describes site-specific management practices for minimizing contamination of storm water runoff and for preventing contaminated storm water runoff from being discharged directly to waters of the State. The SWPPP shall be developed in accordance with the requirements in Attachment M.

   The SWPPP shall cover all areas of the facility and shall include an updated drainage map for the facility. The Discharger shall identify on a map of appropriate scale the areas that contribute runoff to the permitted discharge points; describe the activities in each area and the potential for contamination of storm water runoff and the discharge of hazardous waste/material; and address the feasibility of containment and/or treatment of the storm water. The plans shall be reviewed annually and at the same time. Updated information shall be submitted within 30 days of revision.

B. Compliance Plan

1. The Discharger shall submit quarterly progress reports to describe the progress of studies and or actions undertaken to reduce these compounds in the effluent, and to achieve compliance with the limits in this Order by the deadline specified in provision I.B.5. The first progress report shall be received by the Regional Board by [fill in date], 2003.

2. The interim limits stipulated shall be in effect for a period not to extend beyond September 30, 2005. Thereafter, the Discharger shall comply with the limitations specified in Section I.B.4 of this Order.

3. The Discharger must notify the Regional Board's Executive Officer, in writing, no later than 14 days following each interim date, compliance implementation event, or quarterly report, of the Discharger's compliance or noncompliance with the interim requirements.

C. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR 122.42(a), the Discharger must notify the Board as soon as it knows, or has reason to believe (1) that it has begun or expected to begin, to use or manufacture a toxic pollutant not reported in the permit application, or (2) a discharge of toxic pollutant not limited by this Order has occurred, or will occur, in concentrations that exceed the specified limitations in 40 CFR 122.42(a).

D. The Discharger shall implement or require the implementation of the most effective combination of BMPs for storm water pollution control. When implemented, BMPs are intended to result in the reduction of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable.

E. In the determination of compliance with the monthly average limitations, the following provisions shall apply to all constituents:

1. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly or at a lesser frequency, does not exceed the monthly average limit for that constituent, the Discharger will have demonstrated compliance with the monthly average limit for that month.

2. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly or at a lesser frequency, exceeds the monthly average limit for any constituent, the Discharger shall collect three additional samples at approximately equal intervals during the month. All four analytical results shall be reported in the monitoring report for that month, or 45 days after the sample was obtained, whichever is later.

If the numerical average of the analytical result of these four samples does not exceed the monthly average limit for that constituent, compliance with the monthly average limit has been demonstrated for that month. Otherwise, the monthly average limit has been violated.

3. If the result of one sample collected monthly exceeds the monthly average, then the Discharger is in violation of the monthly average limit.

4. 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. The Discharger shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems installed or used to achieve compliance with this Order.

G. The Discharger shall comply with the waste load allocations that will be developed from the TMDL process for the 303 (d)-listed pollutants.

H. The discharge of any product registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to any waste stream which may ultimately be released to waters of the United States, is prohibited unless specifically authorized elsewhere in this permit or another NPDES permit. This requirement is not applicable to products used for lawn and agricultural purposes.

I. The discharge of any waste resulting from the combustion of toxic or hazardous wastes to any waste stream which ultimately discharges to waters of the United States is prohibited, unless specifically authorized elsewhere in this permit.

J. There shall be no discharge of PCB compounds such as those once commonly used for transformer fluid.

K. The Discharger shall notify the Executive Officer in writing no later than 6 months prior to planned discharge of any chemical, other than chlorine or other product previously reported to the Executive Officer, which may be toxic to aquatic life. Such notification shall include:

1. Name and general composition of the chemical,
2. Frequency of use,
3. Quantities to be used,
4. Proposed discharge concentrations, and
5. USEPA registration number, if applicable.

No discharge of such chemical shall be made prior to the Executive Officer's approval.

L. The Regional Board and USEPA shall be notified immediately by telephone, of the presence of adverse conditions in the receiving waters or on beaches and shores as a result of wastes discharged; written confirmation shall follow as soon as possible but not later than five working days after occurrence.

III. PROVISIONS

A. 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 attached Standard Provisions, those provisions stated herein shall prevail.

B. This Order includes the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 7742. If there is any conflict between provisions stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program and the Standard Provisions, those provisions stated in the former shall prevail.

C. The Discharger shall comply with the requirements of SWPPP updates associated with industrial activity (State Board Order No. 97-03-DWQ adopted on April 17, 1997) and SWPPP updates and monitoring and reporting requirements of State Board general permit for discharges of storm water and Construction Activity (State Board Order No. 99-08-DWQ adopted on August 19, 1999). This Order R4-2003-0119 shall take precedence where conflicts or differences arise between it and the aforementioned Orders.

D. This Order includes the attached *Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Requirements* (Attachment M).

E. This Order may be modified, revoked, reissued, or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR sections 122.44, 122.62, 122.63, 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 Discharger 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.

F. The Discharger must comply with the lawful requirements of municipalities, counties, drainage districts, and other local agencies regarding discharges of storm water to storm drain systems or other water courses under their jurisdiction; including applicable requirements in municipal storm water management program developed to comply with NPDES permits issued by the Regional Board to local agencies.

G. Discharge of wastes to any point other than specifically described in this Order and permit is prohibited and constitutes a violation thereof.

H. The Discharger shall comply with all applicable effluent limitations, national standards of performance, toxic effluent standards, and all federal regulations established pursuant to Sections 301, 302, 303(d), 304, 306, 307, 316, and 423 of the Federal Clean Water Act and amendments thereto.

IV. REOPENERS

A. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with SIP Section 2.2.2.A, to incorporate new limits based on future RPA to be conducted, upon completion of the collection of additional data by the Discharger.

B. This Order may be reopened and modified, to incorporate in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR Parts 122 and 124, to include requirements for the implementation of the watershed management approach.

C. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR Parts 122 and 124, to include new minimum levels (MLs) for each pollutant.

D. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise effluent limitations as a result of future Basin Plan Amendments, or the adoption of a TMDL for the Los Angeles River Watershed Management Area.

E. This Order may be reopened upon the submission by the Discharger, of adequate information, as determined by the Regional Board, to provide for dilution credits or a mixing zone, as may be appropriate.

F. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise the toxicity language once that language becomes standardized.

G. This Order may also be reopened and modified, revoked, and reissued or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR sections 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 and permit, endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity.

H. This Order may also be reopened and modified, revoked, and reissued or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR sections 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 and permit, and endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity.

V. EXPIRATION DATE

This Order expires on August 10, 2008.

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.

VI. RESCISSION

Order No. 96-089, adopted by this Regional Board on December 9, 1996, is hereby rescinded except for enforcement purposes.

I, Dennis Dickerson, 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 September 11, 2003.

_____
Dennis A. Dickerson
Executive Officer