STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
LOS ANGELES REGION
320 W. 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
for
LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
(EASTSIDE LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT)

NPDES Permit No.: CA0064513
Public Notice No.: 03-077

FACILITY ADDRESS	FACILITY MAILING ADDRESS
L.A. County Metropolitan Transportation Authority One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012	L.A. County Metropolitan Transportation Authority One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012 Contact Person: Kathleen Sweet Telephone: (213) 922-7303

I. Public Participation

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Regional Board) is considering the issuance of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the above-referenced facility. As an initial step in the WDR process, the Regional Board staff has developed tentative WDRs. The Regional Board encourages public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Written Comments

The staff determinations are tentative. Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning these tentative WDRs. Comments should be submitted either in person or by mail to:

Executive Officer
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Los Angeles Region
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Board, written comments should be received at the Regional Board offices by 5:00 p.m. on January 9, 2004.

B. Public Hearing

The Regional Board will hold a public hearing on the tentative WDRs during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: January 29, 2004
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Location: The City of Simi Valley Council Chambers,
2929 Tapo Canyon Road, Simi Valley, California.

Interested persons are invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Regional Board will hear testimony, if any, pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. Oral testimony will be heard; however, for accuracy of the record, important testimony should be in writing.

Please be aware that dates and venues may change. Our web address is www.swrcb.ca.gov/rqcb4 where you can access the current agenda for changes in dates and locations.

C. Waste Discharge Requirements Appeals

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) to review the decision of the Regional Board regarding the final WDRs. The petition must be submitted within 30 days of the Regional Board's action to the following address:

State Water Resources Control Board, Office of the Chief Counsel
ATTN: Elizabeth Miller Jennings, Senior Staff Counsel
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

D. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD), related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special conditions, comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at 320 West 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, California 90013, at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Los Angeles Regional Board by calling (213) 576-6600.

E. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

II. Introduction

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) plans to discharge treated wastewater from the underground construction activities of the Eastside Light Rail Transit (ELRT) Project under WDRs and NPDES permit. MTA has filed a ROWD and has applied for WDRs that will serve as a NPDES permit

III. Description of Facility and Waste Discharge

The MTA is constructing the ELRT Project that will be an extension of the recently operational Pasadena Gold Line and the existing Red Line. The ELRT project begins at Union Station and will run on an overpass that will be built by Caltrans as part of the widening of US Highway 101 at that location. From there, the alignment will continue south on Alameda Street to First Street and turn east. The route will follow First Street, over the Los Angeles River, east to Indian Street where the alignment will jog south to Third Street and continue east to end at Atlantic Boulevard.

The 5.9-mile ELRT alignment will be at locations at grade, sometimes elevated, and sometimes below ground. The underground segment will be approximately 9,400 feet in length and runs generally west to east under First Street from Clarence Street to Lorena Street. The underground structures include two stations (First/Boyle Street and First/Soto Street), two portal structures, two cut-and-cover tunnel sections, two bored twin-tunnel sections, six cross-passages, and two sump structures located between the bored tunnels and the two stations. The tunnels will be 19 feet inside diameter each in size and will be as much as 80 feet below existing grade at some points along the alignment.

Environmental investigations of soil and groundwater did not encounter wide-spread contamination along the underground segment, although metals, volatile organic compouns (VOC) and total petroleum hydrocarbons were detected. Historical and current land use includes former oil field activities and leaking petroleum underground tank locations in the vicinity of the underground segments.

Wastewater produced only from underground construction activities (which includes construction site water, storm water, and groundwater generated from dewatering activities) will be discharged. Construction site water will be generated from construction activities at two underground station boxes, at each of the two portal stations, and along the tunnel. The volume of construction site water to be discharged is estimated based on historical quantities of water generated during construction activities on MTA's Red Line tunnel segments.

Storm water will be generated at aboveground construction staging areas located near the underground station boxes and along the alignment. Storm water quantities were estimated using the proposed area of each construction staging location and rainfall data from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Water Resources Division for the Los Angeles Civic Center (Station #716). The maximum rainfall volume of 3.61 inches (for a 24-hour duration rainfall based on a five-year return storm frequency) was used to determine storm water maximum quantities for each location.

Dewatering activities will be associated with construction of the two underground station boxes. Minimal dewatering activities are expected for tunneling operations because MTA plans to use earth-pressure balancing techniques operating a closed-face tunnel boring machine. No dewatering activities are expected for construction of the portals because the construction will probably occur above the groundwater elevation.

MTA plans to discharge treated wastewater through sixteen outfalls (Outfalls 4000, 4010, 4020, 4030, 4040, 4050, 4060, 4070, 4080, 4090, 4100, 4110, 4120, 4130, 4140, and 4150) along the underground section of the ELRT Project. Water will be discharged only from construction activities between the western portal located near Clarence Street, and the eastern portal located at Lorena Street. The outfalls represent locations where sources of wastewater at the construction sites, including minimal storm water, construction process water (wash water, slurry water, fire water, etcetra) and/or groundwater from dewatering, may enter a storm drain catch basin and eventually be conveyed to the Los Angeles River, a water of the United States. The maximum permitted cumulative discharge from the Outfalls is 4.032 mgd, of which it is anticipated that all will be discharged to the sanitary sewer.

The wastewater generated from the underground segment of the ELRT Project will be treated by two mobile treatment units, each capable of treating water quantities of 100 gpm and 700 gpm, respectively. These treatment units will be located at the two below grade stations. The larger capacity unit will be placed in a construction area near the First/ Soto Street Station, and the smaller unit will be placed in a construction staging area near the First/Boyle Street Station.

Both mobile treatment systems have provisions to treat conventional pollutants, metals, VOCs, TPHs, semi-VOCs, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), and perchlorate.

In the proposed treatment system, dewatering fluids enter the system through an inlet manifold to a mixing tank. pH is adjusted and chemicals are added for metal precipitation. The precipitated metals will be removed in an inclined plate clarifier and pH adjusted to neutral conditions. The settled sludge is removed from the bottom of the inclined plate clarifier and stored in settling tanks, which allows time to form a dense sludge. The sludge tank supernatant is recycled back to the chemical mix tank and the settled sludge is pumped back to a filter press system. The sludge is removed from the filter press and transported offsite. Following metals precipitation and neutralization, the dewatering liquid is treated by filtration and through at least two carbon adsorprtion columns placed in series.

MTA plans to bore the tunnel segments using closed face tunnel boring machines. These new machines provide positive control of the tunnel face through mechanical forces applied to the soil trapped in front of a bulkhead, in front of the machine. A screw conveyor or pump through the bulkhead removes only enough soil from the bulkhead chamber to balance that excavated by the machine cutters. The thrust to develop the required force is obtained from jacks reacting against the precast concrete lining segments that are erected within the tail shield of the machines. As the machines

advance grout is placed between the assembled tunnel liner ring and the ground. Thus, lost or over excavated ground is minimized both at the face, and in the tail of the machine. The precast liners are gasketed at the joints, and thus leakage into the tunnel is minimal and the need for dewatering ahead of the tunnel is eliminated.

MTA is planning to discharge the treated wastewater to the municipal sanitary sewer of the City of Los Angeles. This is the Discharger's preferred option and they have obtained an Industrial Discharge Permit from the City of Los Angeles. However, in the case where the flows exceed the hydraulic capacity availability of the sewer lines, then the excess water will be discharged to storm drains. Discharge to storm drains, under the NPDES permit, is a secondary option.

IV. Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations

The requirements contained in the proposed Order are based on the requirements and authorities contained in the following:

A. The Federal Clean Water Act (CWA). The federal Clean Water Act requires that any point source discharges of pollutants to a water of the United States must be done in conformance with an NPDES permit. NPDES permits establish effluent limitations that incorporate various requirements of the CWA designed to protect water quality.

B. Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR) – Protection of Environment, Chapter I, Environmental Protection Agency, Subchapter D, Water Programs, Parts 122-125 and Subchapter N, Effluent Guidelines. These CWA regulations provide effluent limitations for certain dischargers and establish procedures for NPDES permitting, including how to establish effluent limitations, for certain pollutants discharged from the ELRT Project.

C. 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). The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives, and lists the following beneficial uses of the Los Angeles River

Los Angeles River (Upstream of Figueroa Street – Hydrologic Unit 405.21).

Existing: groundwater recharge, contact and non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, and wetland habitat.

Potential: municipal and domestic supply (MUN) and industrial service supply.

The potential MUN beneficial use for the water body is consistent with Regional Board Resolution 89-03; however the Regional Board has only conditionally designated the MUN beneficial uses and at this time cannot establish effluent limitations designed to protect the conditional designation.

Los Angeles River (downstream of Figueroa Street - Hydrologic Unit 405.15)

Existing: groundwater recharge, water contact1 recreation and non-contact recreation, and warm freshwater habitat.

Potential: MUN, and industrial process supply.

Los Angeles River (to Estuary - Hydrologic Unit 405.12)

Existing: groundwater recharge, water contact1 recreation and non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater habitat, marine habitat, wildlife habitat, and rare, threatened, or endangered species.

Potential: MUN, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, migration of aquatic organisms, spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, and shellfish harvesting.

Los Angeles River (Estuary - Hydrologic Unit 405.12)

Existing: industrial service supply, navigation, water contact1 recreation and non-contact water recreation, commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, marine habitat, wildlife habitat, rare, threatened, or endangered species, migration of aquatic organisms, spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, and wetland habitat.

Potential: shellfish harvesting.

D. The 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 Los Angeles River watershed.

E. On May 18, 2000, the USEPA promulgated numeric criteria for priority pollutants for the State of California [known as the *California Toxics Rule* (CTR) and codified as 40 CFR section 131.38]. 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.

F. On March 2, 2000, 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 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 provide a rationale approach for determining reasonable potential and represent the best available science with respect to minimum levels for all surface water discharges. The SIP requires the dischargers' submittal of data sufficient to conduct the determination of priority pollutants requiring water quality based effluent limitations (WQBELs) and to calculate the effluent limitations. The CTR criteria for freshwater 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 Los Angeles River.

G. 40 CFR Section 122.44(d)(vi)(A) requires the establishment of numeric effluent limitations to attain and maintain applicable narrative water quality criteria to protect the designated beneficial uses. Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established in the Basin Plan, 40 CFR section 122.44(d) specifies that water quality based effluent limits (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.

H. State and Federal 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 Los Angeles River upstream of Figueroa Street is impaired for certain constituents and consistent with the anti-degradation policy contained at 40 CFR 131.12 and State Board Resolution 68-16, the effluent limitations established in this Order will protect and maintain the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses in the receiving water. Further the highest statutory and regulatory requirements are required for this new point source. Allowing the discharge covered by the accompanying Order is consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State, as it allows historical contamination that threatens local groundwater resources to be remediated and thereby assures a safe, consistent source of drinking water for thousands of citizens.

I. Effluent limitations are established in accordance with sections 301, 304, 306, and 307 of the federal Water Pollution Control Act, and amendments thereto. These requirements, as they are met, will maintain and protect the beneficial uses of the Los Angeles River.

V. Regulatory Basis for Effluent Limitations

The CWA requires point source discharges to control the amount of conventional, nonconventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of the discharge of pollutants is established through NPDES permits that contain effluent limitations and standards. The CWA establishes two principal bases for effluent limitations. First, dischargers are required to meet technology-based effluent limitations that reflect the best controls available considering costs and economic impact. Second, they are required to meet WQBELs that are developed to protect applicable designated uses of the receiving water.

The CWA requires that technology-based effluent limitations be established based on several levels of controls:

- Best practicable treatment control technology (BPT) is based on the average of the best performance by plants within an industrial category or subcategory. BPT standards apply to toxic, conventional, and nonconventional pollutants.

- Best available technology economically achievable (BAT) represents the best existing performance of treatment technologies that are economically achievable within an industrial point source category. BAT standards apply to toxic and nonconventional pollutants.

- Best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) is a standard for the control from existing industrial point sources of conventional pollutants including BOD, TSS, fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease. The BCT standard is established after considering the "cost reasonableness" of the relationship between the cost of attaining a reduction in effluent discharge and the benefits that would result, and also the cost effectiveness of additional industrial treatment beyond BPT.

- New source performance standards (NSPS) that represent the best available demonstrated control technology standards. The intent of NSPS guidelines is to set limitations that represent state-of-the-art treatment technology for new sources.

The CWA requires EPA to develop effluent limitations, guidelines and standards (ELGs) representing application of BPT, BCT, BAT, and NSPS. Section 402(a)(1) of the CWA and 40 CFR 125.3 of the NPDES regulations authorize the use of best professional judgment (BPJ) to derive technology-based effluent limitations on a case-by-case basis where ELGs are not available for certain industrial categories and/or pollutants of concern.

If a reasonable potential exists for pollutants in a discharge to cause, or contribute to, an exceedance of water quality standards, WQBELs are also required under 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i). WQBELs are established after determining that technology-based limitations are not stringent enough to ensure that state water quality standards are met for the receiving water. WQBELs are based on the designated use of the receiving water, water quality criteria necessary to support the designated uses, and the state's antidegradation policy. For discharges to inland surface waters, the SIP establishes specific implementation procedures for determining reasonable potential and establishing WQBELs for priority pollutant criteria promulgated by USEPA through the CTR and NTR, as well as the Basin Plan.

There are several other specific factors affecting the development of limitations and requirements in the proposed Order. These are discussed as follows:

A. Pollutants of Concern

The CWA requires that any pollutant that may be discharged by a point source in quantities of concern must be regulated through an NPDES permit. Further, the NPDES regulations require regulation of any pollutant that (1) causes; (2) has the reasonable potential to cause; or (3) contributes to the exceedance of a receiving water quality criteria or objective.

Effluent limitations in the current permit were established for conventional pollutants, metals, and volatile toxic pollutants that are present because of past and current activities near the site that resulted in contamination of the groundwater.

B. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limits

As specified in 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include WQBELs for toxic pollutants (including toxicity) that are or may be discharged at levels which cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard. The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses for the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria (that are contained in other state plans and policies, or USEPA water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR).

The CTR criteria for freshwater or human health for consumption of organisms, whichever is more stringent, are used to prescribe the effluent limitations in this Order to protect the beneficial uses of the Los Angeles River.

1. Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA)

In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, the Regional Board conducts a reasonable potential analysis for each priority pollutant with an applicable criterion or objective to determine if a WQBEL is required in the permit. The Regional Board analyzes effluent data to determine if a pollutant in a discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above a state water quality standard. For all parameters that have a reasonable potential, numeric WQBELs are required. The RPA considers water quality objectives outlined in the CTR, NTR, as well as the Basin Plan. To conduct the RPA, the Regional Board must identify the maximum observed effluent concentration (MEC) for each constituent, based on data provided by the Discharger.

Section 1.3 of the SIP provides the procedures for determining reasonable potential to exceed water applicable water quality criteria and objectives. The SIP specifies three triggers to complete a RPA:

a. Trigger 1 – If the MEC is greater than or equal to the CTR water quality criteria or applicable objective (C), a limit is needed.

b. Trigger 2 – If MEC<C and backgroundwater quality (B) > C, a limit is needed.

c. Trigger 3 – If other related information such as CWA 303(d) listing for a pollutant, discharge type, compliance history, etc. indicates that a WQBEL is required.

Sufficient effluent and ambient data are needed to conduct a complete RPA. However, it is important to understand that under Trigger 3, the Regional Board staff may determine reasonable potential based on the discharger type. In this case, the contaminants the Discharger is treating are likely to be present in effluent based on influent data and the treatment system and of the Regional Board's experience with similar discharges. As a result, it is appropriate to conclude that there is RPA for certain toxic chemicals present in the discharge. Effluent limitations are appropriately imposed accompanying that this is a new discharge and is consistent with antidegradation requirements.

The Discharger will be required to gather the necessary data to conduct the RPA for other CTR constituents for which the Regional Board does not establish effluent limitations. Upon review of the data, and if the Regional Board determines that WQBELs are needed to protect the beneficial uses, the permit will be reopened for appropriate modification.

2. Calculating WQBELs

If a reasonable potential exists to exceed applicable water quality criteria or objectives, then a WQBEL must be established in accordance with one of three procedures contained in Section 1.4 of the SIP. These procedures include:

a. If applicable and available, use of the wasteload allocation (WLA) established as part of a total maximum daily load (TMDL).

b. Use of a steady-state model to derive maximum daily effluent limitations (MDELs) and average monthly effluent limitations (AMELs).

c. Where sufficient effluent and receiving water data exist, use of a dynamic model which has been approved by the Regional Board.

3. Impaired Water Bodies in 303 (d) List

Section 303(d) of the CWA requires states to identify specific water bodies where water quality standards are not expected to be met after implementation of technology-based effluent limitations on point sources. For all 303(d) listed water bodies and pollutants, the Regional Board plans to develop and adopt

TMDLs that will specify WLAs for point sources and load allocations (LAs) for non-point sources, as appropriate.

The USEPA has approved the State's 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. Certain receiving waters in the Los Angeles and Ventura County Watersheds do not fully support beneficial uses and therefore have been classified as impaired on the 2002 California 303(d) list and have been scheduled for TMDL development.

The Los Angeles River watershed is one of the largest in the Region. It is also one of the most diverse in terms of land use patterns. The Los Angeles River flows for 55 miles from the Santa Monica Mountains (at the western end of the San Fernando Valley) to the Pacific Ocean at San Pedro Bay. The natural hydrology of the river and many of its tributaries has been altered by flood control efforts including the channelization of much of the river and construction of flood control reservoirs. Most of the mainstream of the Los Angeles River and most of the tributaries are concrete-lined. Approximately 324 square miles of the Watershed are covered by forest or open space land. The rest of the watershed is highly developed. Major tributieries to the river include: Pacoima Wash, Tujunga Wash, Burbank Western Channel, Verdugo Wash, Arroyo Seco, Rio Hondo, and Compton Creek.

The 2002 California 303(d) list, approved by the USEPA on July 25, 2003, identified the following pollutants of concern for Los Angeles River:

Los Angeles River - Reach 2 (Carson to Figueroa Street): ammonia, coliform, lead, nutrients (algae), odors, oil, scum, and trash;

Los Angeles River - Reach 1 (Estuary to Carson Street): total aluminum, ammonia, dissolved cadmium, dissolved copper, coliform, lead, nutrients (algae), pH, scum/foam-unnatural, and dissolved zinc;

Los Angeles River Estuary (Queensway Bay): chlordane (sediment), DDT (sediment), lead (sediment), PCBs (sediment), and zinc (sediment).

4. Whole Effluent Toxicity

Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) protects the receiving water quality from the aggregate toxic effect of a mixture of pollutants in the effluent. WET tests measure the degree of response of exposed aquatic test organisms to an effluent. The WET approach allows for protection of the narrative "no toxics in toxic amounts" criterion while implementing numeric criteria for toxicity. There are two types of WET tests: acute and chronic. An acute toxicity test is conducted over a short time period and measures mortality. A chronic toxicity test is conducted over a longer period of time and measures mortality, reproduction, and growth.

The Basin Plan specifies a narrative objective for toxicity, requiring that all waters be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are lethal to or produce other detrimental response on aquatic organisms. Detrimental response includes but is not limited to decreased growth rate, decreased reproductive success of resident or indicator species, and/or significant alterations in population, community ecology, or receiving water biota. The existing permit contains acute toxicity limitations to implement requirements of the Basin Plan. Specifically, the acute toxicity limitations dictate that the average survival in undiluted effluent for any three consecutive 96-hour static or continuous flow bioassay tests shall be at least 90%, with no single test having less than 70% survival.

The treatment system influent may contain toxic constituents and as discussed above, there is a reasonable potential for these constituents to impact receiving waters. MTA will be required to conduct acute toxicity testing in accordance with the permit requirements.

C. Specific Rationale for Each Numerical Effluent Limitation

The following table presents the effluent limitations and the specific rationales for pollutants that are expected to be present in the discharge:

Constituents	Units	Discharge Limitations		Basis
		Monthly Average	Daily maximum	
Total suspended solids	mg/L	50	75	BPJ
$BOD_5 20^oC$	mg/L	20	30	BPJ
Oil and grease	mg/L	10	15	BPJ
Settleable solids	ml/L	0.1	0.3	BPJ
Turbidity	NYU	50	75	BPJ
Sulfides	mg/L	-	1	BPJ
Phenol	mg/L	-	1	BPJ
Methylene Blue Active Substance (MBAS)	mg/L	-	0.5	BPJ
Total dissolved solids	mg/L	-	950	Basin Plan
Sulfate	mg/L	-	300	Basin Plan
Chloride	mg/L	-	150	Basin Plan
Ammonia	mg/L	Table 3-1 [1/ 3/]	Table 3-3 [1/, 2/, 3/]	Basin Plan
Nitrate-nitrogen	mg/L	10 [1/]		Basin Plan
Nitrire-nitrogen	mg/L	1		Basin Plan
Nitrate-nitrogen plus nitrite-nitrogen	mg/L	10 [1/]		Basin Plan
Arsenic	µg/L		50	BPJ
Cadmium	µg/L	2.2	4.3	CTR
Chromium III	µg/L	-	50	BPJ

Constituents	Units	Discharge Limitations		Basis
		Monthly Average	Daily maximum	
Chromium VI	µg/L	8	16	CTR
Copper	µg/L	9	13	CTR
Cyanide	µg/L	5.2	22	CTR
Lead	µg/L	2.5	65	CTR
Mercury	µg/L	-	0.051	CTR
Nickel	µg/L	52	470	CTR
Selenium	µg/L	5	-	CTR
Silver	µg/L	-	3.4	CTR
Thallium	µg/L	-	6.3	CTR
Zinc	µg/L	-	120	CTR
1,1-Dichloroethane	µg/L	-	5	BPJ
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	-	3.2	CTR
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	-	11	CTR
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	-	0.5	BPJ
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	-	0.66	CTR
Benzene	µg/L	-	1	BPJ
Carbon tetrachloride	µg/L	-	4.4	CTR
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	-	34	CTR
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	-	46	CTR
Methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE)	µg/L	-	13	BPJ
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	-	8.85	CTR
Toluene	µg/L	-	150	BPJ
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	-	5	BPJ
Xylene	µg/L		1750	BPJ
4,4-DDD	µg/L	-	0.00084	CTR
4,4-DDE	µg/L	-	0.00059	CTR
Aldrin	µg/L	-	0.00014	CTR
alpha-BHC	µg/L	-	0.013	CTR
Beta-BHC	µg/L	-	0.046	CTR
Endosufan sulfate	µg/L	-	240	CTR
Endrin aldehyde	µg/L	-	0.81	CTR
Gamma BHC	µg/L	-	0.063	CTR
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)	µg/L	-	0.00017	CTR
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	-	0.54	CTR
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	-	790	CTR
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	-	9.1	CTR
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	-	6.5	CTR
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	-	400	CTR
3,3-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	-	0.077	CTR

Constituents	Units	Discharge Limitations		Basis
		Monthly Average	Daily maximum	
Benzidine	µg/L	-	0.00054	CTR
Benzo (a) Anthracene	µg/L	-	0.049	CTR
Benzo (b) Pyrene	µg/L	-	0.049	CTR
Benzo (b) Fluoranthene	µg/L	-	0.049	CTR
Benzo (k) Fluoranthene	µg/L	-	0.049	CTR
Bis (2-Chloroethyl) Ether	µg/L		1.4	CTR
Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	-	5.9	CTR
Chrysene	µg/L	-	0.049	CTR
Dibenzo (a,h) Anthracene	µg/L	-	0.049	CTR
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	-	0.00077	CTR
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	-	50	CTR
Indeno (1,2,3-cd) Pyrene	µg/L	-	0.049	CTR
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	µg/L	-	1.4	CTR
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	-	16	CTR
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	-	8.2	CTR
2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	µg/L	-	0.000000014	CTR
Tertiary butyl alchol	µg/L	-	12	BPJ
Total petroleum hydrocarbon	µg/L	-	100	BPJ
Acute toxicity	% Survival			Basin Plan

CTR = California Toxics Rule , BPJ = Best professional judgement is the method used by permit writers to develop technology-based NPDES permit conditions on a case-by-case basis using all reasonably available and relevant data. BPJ limits are established in cases where effluent limitation guidelines are not available for a particular pollutant of concern. Authorization for BPJ limits is found under section 401(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act and under 40 CFR 125.3.

1/ This is the water quality objective in the current Basin Plan. This effluent limitation will stay in effect until the Nitrogen Compound and Related Effects TMDL for the Los Angeles River, Resolution No. 03-009, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Include a TMDL for Nitrogen Compounds in the Los angeles River* (*Nitrogen Compounds TMDL)*, is approved by USEPA (i.e., the effective date of the TMDL). If U.S. EPA does not approve the *Nitrogen Compounds TMDL*, this effluent limitation will remain in effect until revised by the Regional Board.

2/ Discharger must comply with the updated ammonia water quality objectives in the Basin Plan (Attachment H) Table 3-1 (for daily maximum limit) and Table 3-3 (for monthly average limit) which resulted from Resolution No. 2002-011 adopted by the Regional Board on April 25, 2002.

3/ For compliance with Maximum Concentration (CMC) in Attachment H, the pH sample collected in the receiving water downstream of the discharge and the ammonia nitrogen sample collected in the effluent, shall be taken and reported at the same time. Shall there be no receiving water present, the pH of the effluent at the end of pipe shall be determined and reported.

D. Monitoring Requirements

According to Section 1.3 of the SIP, if data are unavailable or insufficient to conduct the RPA, the Regional Board must establish requirements that require monitoring for the pollutants in place of a WQBEL. Upon completion of the required monitoring, the Regional Board must use the gathered data to conduct the RPA and determine if a WQBEL is required. As prescribed in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Regional Board shall require periodic monitoring for pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established.

To assess the impact of the discharge to the beneficial uses of the receiving waters, the Discharger is required to monitor the conventional and priority pollutants for both effluents from the sixteen outfalls and receiving water monitoring (at both upstream and downstream of the discharges points). Monitoring of these pollutants will characterize the wastes discharged.