

**Comments Received on draft Ventura County MS4 Permit
December 27, 2006**

**From: Yugal K. Lall, P.E.
City Engineer/Public Works Director
City of Moorpark**

To: RWQCB-LA

Date: March 7, 2007



City of Moorpark

CITY ENGINEER/PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

799 Moorpark Avenue, Moorpark, California 93021 (805) 517-6256 fax (805) 532-2555

March 7, 2007

Mr. Jonathan Bishop
Executive Officer
Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
320 Fourth Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Subject: **12/27/06 Draft Order – Ventura County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (NPDES No. CAS004002) - Comments**


Dear Mr. Bishop:

In reference to the above subject, the City of Moorpark (City) wishes to inform you that we have completed our review and offer the following comments. The City supports the March 6, 2007 Ventura Countywide Stormwater Program (Ventura Program) Chair, Gerhardt Hubner, letter addressed to you and the attachments thereof. The City also supports the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) statements identified in Exhibit A. We further emphasize that:

- The City is one of the sister cities within the County of Ventura and has worked in close collaboration with the entire Ventura Program while maintaining and improving regional water quality.
- The excluder requirement in the Draft Order is unachievable as more than 30% of the City lies within the 100 year flood plain – excluders would pose a great and significant risk and threat to public safety by causing flooding to a majority of the homes and businesses within the City.
- The Draft Order goes well beyond the requirements of the Clean Water Act's unfunded mandate making the cost of compliance unreal and totally out of the reach of Phase II cities.
- Without major modifications to this Draft Order, it would be totally impractical to implement for public safety and from financial limitations.

The City looks forward to your responses to this letter and to the Hubner's letter and attachments thereof, and TMDL comments identified in Exhibit A. Please feel free to contact me at (805) 517-6255, if you have questions.

Sincerely,


Yugal K. Lall, PE
City Engineer/Public Works Director

Attachment: Exhibit A

c: Xavier Swamikannu

city share/public works/everyone/letters/NPDES No. CAS004002

PATRICK HUNTER
Mayor

KEITH F. MILLHOUSE
Mayor Pro Tem

ROSEANN MIKOS
Councilmember

JANICE PARVIN
Councilmember

MARK VAN DAM
Councilmember

RECEIVED
2007 MAR -9 PM 2:18
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER
QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
LOS ANGELES REGION

EXHIBIT A

Comments to 12/27/06 Ventura County MS4 Draft Order Related to Adopted TMDLs

Camarillo agrees with the Ventura Countywide Program's comment letter and related attachments and submits the following comments that are more associated to sections of the Draft Order related to Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and the implications on our City.

Summary of TMDL Comments

As drafted, the Draft Order fails to coordinate with the TMDLs that have been written and that will be written for the CCW and to adequately capture the TMDL implementation plan and schedule. Following are our comments on ways to successfully coordinate efforts required under this Draft Order with the TMDL requirements.

The TMDLs that have been developed in the Calleguas Creek underwent significant technical analysis, stakeholder input, and public review to develop wasteload allocations (WLAs) and implementation actions that will result in compliance with water quality objectives for the listed pollutants. The TMDLs also lay out direction for how to implement the TMDL provisions into NPDES permits. Rather than following the direction of the TMDL and including identified implementation actions, the Draft Order includes numerous additional requirements and does not appropriately capture the intent of the TMDL. The Draft Order needs to be consistent with the TMDLs to allow for effective implementation of TMDL requirements and to prevent confusion and additional costs for programs that have not been evaluated as part of the TMDL process and may not be effective for implementing the program.

The comments in this letter are designed to make the TMDL provisions of the Draft Order consistent with the TMDL requirements. The comments are organized with comments on language presented in the Draft Order outside of the TMDL provisions section first, then suggestions for the TMDL provisions, then comments on Attachment F- Monitoring Program and Attachment H-Reporting Program. Suggested language for incorporating the TMDL provisions into the Draft Order and the Monitoring Program is included as an attachment.

Specific Comments on TMDL language in the FINDINGS Section of Draft Order

Page 4, Findings 8 and 9. The 303(d) list provides information on waterbodies exceeding established water quality standards (40CFR130.7(b)). The 303(d) list does not provide information on, nor should it be used as justification for findings that require bioassessment and ecological restoration. The first sentence of findings 8 and 9 that reference the 303(d) list should be removed.

Page 6, Finding 12. The finding regarding salts is inaccurate and inconsistent with the effective chloride TMDLs and the work being done to develop a salts TMDL in the Calleguas Creek Watershed. Salts impact agricultural and groundwater recharge beneficial uses and are only a concern for aquatic life at levels much higher than those required to protect agriculture. Additionally, swimming pools, though a potential salt

source, have not yet been identified as a significant salt source to the waterbodies in any of the TMDL analyses developed to date. Finally, the effective chloride TMDLs do not include allocations for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) discharges. Therefore, this finding should be removed.

Page 8, Finding 17. The information referenced in this finding comes from two highly urbanized counties that significantly differ from any portion or portions of Ventura County. The trash TMDLs currently being developed in Ventura County are in the process of identifying the sources of the trash and initial indicators suggest that the MS4s may not be the most significant source of trash. Additionally, the amount of trash present in the waterbodies is significantly lower than the amount found in Los Angeles County. Although trash is a potential problem in Ventura County, the problem is not of the same magnitude as that in other Southern California Counties and the finding should acknowledge the differences.

Page 11., D.4. All of the TMDLs require the development of a monitoring plan on an approved schedule and the submittal of the monitoring plan to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) for approval. If the monitoring plan is not submitted, responsible parties are subject to enforcement actions. As a result, there is no need for the Draft Order to include default monitoring requirements. Including separate monitoring requirements for the MS4s would require them to implement actions above and beyond those required in the TMDL and beyond those being imposed on other dischargers to the impaired waterbodies. Additionally, the time schedules provided in the TMDLs are designed to allow the development of a comprehensive and coordinated monitoring program to address TMDL compliance. Requiring additional monitoring actions while this program is being developed would divert resources from the TMDL monitoring program development. As a result, the Draft Order should just include the requirement to participate in the development and implementation of the TMDL Monitoring Programs and submit the monitoring plans by the date required in the TMDL. For all of the effective TMDLs, monitoring programs have been submitted to the RWQCB and are awaiting approval.

Page 13, E. 6. The consent decree requires adoption of all TMDLs for constituents and waterbodies listed on the 1998 303(d) list. Any listings that have occurred since the 1998 list are not subject to the requirement that they be completed within 13 years. The language in this discussion should be changed to reflect this distinction.

Page 15, E. 13. (a) (1) (F) Compliance with the WLAs for the Santa Clara River TMDL was required at the effective date of the TMDL, not one year after the effective date as stated in this section. Submittal of the monitoring plan for determining compliance with the TMDL was required one year after the effective date. The language should be modified accordingly.

Page 16, E. 13 (a) (2) (G) To be consistent with the other TMDL write-ups in this section, a statement H should be included that reads "Compliance for Winter Wet WLA is 10 years after effective date." Statements F and G would be more clear if the WLA was added to

the language.

Page 16. E. 13 (a) (3) (F) Please clarify that compliance with interim WLA is required at the effective date, but compliance with the final WLA for toxicity is not required until 2 years after the effective date.

Page 16. E. 13 (a) (4) (F) To be consistent with the other TMDL write-ups in this section, a statement G should be included that reads "Compliance for final WLA is 20 years after effective date."

Page 103. Point Zero definition. Point Zero is not defined in the TMDLs. Compliance with TMDLs is required in-stream at the defined compliance points for the TMDL. The Point Zero definition should be removed and references to the definition should not be included in the Draft Order.

Attachment A. This attachment is misleading in that it implies that all of the waterbodies in a given watershed management area are listed for the 303(d) pollutant(s) of concern. The attachment should be revised to accurately associate the pollutants with the waterbodies for which they are listed.

Comments on Dry Weather Discharge Prohibition Language to Implement TMDLs

The Draft Order contains requirements on Page 31, Part 3, A. 3., Page 88, Part 6, and in Attachment F, Page F-10, Part D.2.a.1. and a.2. to prohibit dry weather discharges in order to implement the TMDL dry weather WLAs. The TMDLs do not include any provisions that require the prohibition of all dry weather discharges and include the statement that California Water Code Section 13360 precludes the Regional Board from specifying the method of compliance with the waste discharge requirements. Although one mechanism for complying with the TMDL WLAs may be to prohibit dry weather discharges, each responsible party has the authority to determine the most appropriate mechanism for complying with the allocations. Requiring prohibition of all dry weather discharges for TMDL implementation goes beyond the intent of the TMDL and would require costs and efforts to control discharges that may not be contributing to the waterbody impairment. Effective control of dry weather discharges that may contribute to exceedances of the WLAs through BMP implementation is a more productive and effective way of addressing impairments in the waterbody and ensuring compliance with the dry weather WLAs.

Secondly, the TMDL analysis includes an assessment of the amount of dry weather discharge of pollutants that can occur and still allow the waterbody to meet water quality objectives. As discussed in the linkage analysis for all of the TMDLs, the dry weather discharges from MS4s are considered in the analysis and the WLAs assume dry weather discharges from MS4s. As a result, the prohibition of dry weather discharges is not a required provision of the TMDL.

The TMDLs also include statements that allow the allocations to be achieved through the implementation of BMPs. "Storm water WLAs will be incorporated into the NPDES permit as receiving water limits measured at the downstream points of each subwatershed and

are expected to be achieved through the implementation of BMPs as outlined in the implementation plan." (Calleguas Creek OC Pesticide and Toxicity TMDL BPAs). This type of language has been included in the Draft Order in reference to wet weather WLAs, but not for dry weather allocations. The TMDL implementation language does not make a distinction about the implementation mechanism for dry and wet weather allocations. The language for dry and wet weather WLA compliance should be consistent.

Finally, the Draft Order includes other language that specifically allows some types of non-storm water discharges in conjunction with the implementation of BMPs (Page 26, Part 2. B.- Non-storm water discharges). The language related to dry weather discharge prohibitions for TMDL implementation should be revised to be consistent with these other provisions of the Draft Order. Suggested language is shown below.

"PART 3 – STORM WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

A. General Requirements

3. Each Permittee shall implement programs and measures to comply with the TMDLs' WLAs for the MS4 as follows:

(1) Dry Weather Discharges- achieve the concentration or load based numerical limitation for dry weather discharge identified in this Order (Part 6. Total Maximum Daily Load Provisions) through implementation of BMPs and effective control of non-storm water discharges consistent with Part 1. Section B of this order."

TMDL Reopener Language

All of the TMDLs referenced in the Draft Order contain provisions that allow the allocations, implementation requirements, and implementation schedule to be adjusted based on the results of special studies and other actions. The Draft Order should include a statement that allows the revision of Order if the TMDL is changed. Suggested language for this provision is as follows:

"This Order may be modified to address changes to wasteload allocations, numeric targets, or implementation provisions of any TMDLs incorporated into this order."

The language could be included in the TMDL provisions section or on page 113 under the Reopener and Modification discussion.

Comments on Part 6-Total Maximum Daily Load Provisions (Pages 88-94)

The following comments summarize the issues with the TMDL Provisions section of the Draft Order that pertain to the Calleguas Creek Watershed. Attachment A provides suggested language for this portion of the order that would replace the current language in the Draft Order. The suggested language addresses the comments discussed below.

Introductory Paragraphs

TMDLs are required to achieve water quality objectives and protect beneficial uses. The statement that "The objective of the TMDL is to restore the waterbody to the highest beneficial use or potential beneficial use designated by the Regional Water Board." is erroneous and should be modified to correctly reflect 40 CFR 130 (c)(1) which states "TMDLs shall be established at levels necessary to attain and maintain the applicable narrative and numerical WQS."

As stated previously, the second introductory paragraph should be revised to remove the reference to dry weather prohibition as shown in the attachment.

Part 6.3. Calleguas Creek, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon-Toxicity, Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon TMDL

The WLAs included in the Toxicity TMDL should include the effective dates for the interim and final limits.

The WLAs included in the Toxicity TMDL apply during both dry and wet weather. The dry label should be removed from the tables.

The Toxicity WLA is implemented as a trigger for conducting TIEs. "The toxicity WLAs will be implemented in accordance with US EPA, State Board and Regional Board resolutions, guidance and policy at the time of permit issuance or renewal." Currently, these WLAs would be implemented as a trigger for initiation of the TIE/TRE process as outlined in USEPA's "Understanding and Accounting for Method Variability in Whole Effluent Toxicity Applications Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program" (2000) and current NPDES permits held by discharged in the CCW." (Calleguas Creek Toxicity TMDL BPA). The trigger language should be included in the Numeric Limits discussion.

Part 6.4. Calleguas Creek, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon-Organochlorine (OC) Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB) and Siltation TMDL

The WLAs included in the OC Pesticides TMDL should include the effective dates for the interim limits. The final limits should not be included in the Order because the effective date of the final WLA is not within the permit term covered by the Order.

The WLAs included in the OC Pesticides TMDL are annual averages. The table showing the limits should state that they are annual average limits, not dry weather allocations.

The Siltation TMDL allocation is a **reduction** in sediment discharges of 2496 tons/yr, not a limitation on the amount of sediment that can be discharged. The

limits should be changed to reflect that the allocation is a reduction in the amount discharged.

Attachment F-Monitoring Program

The TMDL monitoring and implementation requirements included in the Draft Order are inconsistent with the intent of the TMDLs. The majority of the issues in the program have been discussed previously in this comment letter, but some specific comments are discussed here.

As discussed previously, all of the TMDLs require the development of a monitoring plan on an approved schedule and the submittal of the monitoring plan to the Regional Board for approval. If the monitoring plan is not submitted, responsible parties are subject to enforcement actions. As a result, there is no need for the Draft Order to include default monitoring requirements. The additional "default" monitoring requirements included in Attachment F require actions above and beyond those required in the TMDL and beyond those being imposed on other dischargers to the impaired waterbodies. As a result, the Draft Order should just include the requirement to participate in the development and implementation of the TMDL Monitoring Programs and submit the monitoring plans by the date required in the TMDL. For all of the effective TMDLs, monitoring programs have been submitted to the RWQCB and are awaiting approval.

Additionally, the submitted monitoring plans contain Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) and have specific sample collection requirements. Therefore, this order should not include specific monitoring requirements for the TMDL monitoring. Bullets 3 through 6 under the introductory paragraph should be deleted (see attachment A for suggested changes).

Monitoring results for the TMDL monitoring program will be submitted in an annual report to the Regional Board. This Order should not include the requirement for the TMDL monitoring to be included in the MS4 permit annual report as the TMDL monitoring program report should be sufficient to meet the TMDL requirements. Therefore, Bullets 7 and 8 under the introductory paragraph should be deleted.

The implementation language in the TMDL for all of the TMDLs is inappropriate. Each TMDL includes specific implementation actions that are required of the MS4 Permittees. All language related to the TMDL implementation should be specific to the TMDL. Additional requirements above and beyond the TMDL requirements should not be included in the Draft Order. The requirements included in this section should be removed and replaced with language specific to the implementation actions included in the TMDL implementation schedules presented in the Basin Plan Amendments for each of the TMDLs. Attachment A includes suggested language for the TMDL implementation provisions.

Finally, where activities required to be conducted for implementation of the other provisions of the order overlap with TMDL requirements, the two programs should be

allowed to coordinate. Specifically, the special study required under the Calleguas Creek Toxicity TMDL to investigate the pesticides that will be used to replace diazinon and chlorpyrifos could be used to meet the requirements of the pyrethroid special study and public outreach programs required under the TMDL could be met through the Public Outreach requirements Part 4.C. Public Information and Participation Program (PIPP).

Attachment H-Reporting Program

The TMDL Compliance monitoring reporting provisions included in this attachment should be changed to be consistent with the changes requested in this comment letter. Specifically:

Page H-2, Part 1.A.4. The requirements to provide information on the field screening for illicit connections should be deleted as discussed above.

Page H-5, Part 1.C.4. The results of TMDL monitoring will be submitted to the Regional Board as part of an annual report each year. The requirement to submit the monitoring results no later than 45 days from the sample collection date is inconsistent with the TMDL requirements and puts an additional burden on the MS4s that will not be imposed on the other responsible parties for the TMDL. The reporting requirements in the TMDL require submittal of an annual report to the Regional Board, and the Order does not need to require anything above and beyond the TMDL reporting requirement.

Page H-4, Part 2.B.3.a. The TMDLs require submission of a monitoring plan for approval by the Regional Board. As discussed above, additional monitoring requirements should not be included in this order. Therefore, the provision to provide a report on the SMC toxicity protocol should be removed from the Order.

Attachment 1 to Exhibit A

Suggested Language Changes to Draft Order Pertaining to TMDLs

Specific language changes to text in the Order are included below in tracked changes. However, we suggest that the specific WLA and TMDL monitoring provisions be replaced by the language shown below. Those provisions are not shown in tracked changes because we suggest that the entire section be replaced.

PART 6 – TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD PROVISION

Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) are numerical calculations of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still meet water quality standards, and an allocation of that amount to the pollutant's sources. A TMDL is the sum of the allowable loads of a single pollutant from all contributing points (Waste Load Allocation) and non-point sources (Load Allocation). Municipal storm water discharges are considered a point source and have been assigned a WLA for certain pollutants. The objective of the TMDL is to ~~restore the waterbody to the highest beneficial use or potential beneficial use~~ meet water quality standards designated by the Regional Water Board.

This Order incorporates MS4 WLAs that have been adopted by the Regional Water Board and have been approved by the Office of Administrative Law and the U.S. EPA. The WLAs in the Order are expressed ~~either as a numerical receiving water limitations, A, or a suite of BMPs that have provide been determined as providing a reasonable expectation that the WLAs will be achieved~~ can be substituted for the limitation with approval of the Regional Board (See Part 4.A.2) for wet weather flows, or as a prohibition for dry weather flows. Permittees shall implement all control measures to achieve the TMDL WLA(s) as stated in the TMDL by the WLA(s) effective date(s).

1. Watershed – Pollutant

Santa Clara River and its Tributaries' (Reach 3) – Nitrogen Compounds (Ammonia and Nitrate plus Nitrite)

(a) WLA Implementation

(1) Numerical Limits:

The WLAs are expressed as numerical receiving water limits for Ammonia and Nitrate plus Nitrite within Reach 3 of the Santa Clara River. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees (Ventura County Watershed Protection District and the Cities of Santa Paula and Fillmore) are the following (see Table 11):

Table 11. Receiving water final limits, effective March 23, 2004:

Constituent	Acute (1-hour average)	Chronic (30-day average)
Ammonia (mg/L)	4.2	2.0
Nitrate + Nitrite (mg/L)	N/A	8.1

2. Watershed – Pollutant
Malibu Creek and Lagoon - Bacteria

(a) WLA Implementation

(1) Numerical Limits:

The WLAs are expressed as exceedance days in-stream for Bacteria within the Malibu Creek and Lagoon watershed. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees are the following (see Table 12 and Table 13):

Table 12. Receiving water final limits for exceedance days

Effective Date	Allocation	Daily Exceedance Days Single sample targets	Weekly Exceedance Days Single sample targets	Exceedance days for 30-day geometric mean targets
January 24, 2009	Summer Dry (April 1-Oct. 31)	0	0	0
January 24, 2012	Winter Dry (November 1-March 31)	3	1	0
January 24, 2016	Wet (November 1-October 31)	17	3	0

Table 13. Summary of Single Sample and 30-day Geometric Mean targets used to determine compliance with exceedance day allocations

Waterbody	Constituent	Single Sample Target (MPN/100 mL)	30-day Geometric Mean Target (MPN/100 mL)
Freshwater	E. Coli	235	126
	Fecal Coliform	400	200
Marine	Total Coliform	10,000	1,000
	Fecal Coliform	400	200
	Enterococcus	104	35
	Total Coliform (if ratio of fecal-to-total coliform is >0.1)	1,000	N/A

3. Watershed – Pollutant

Calleguas Creek, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon-Toxicity, Chlorpyrifos, and Diazinon.

(a) WLA Implementation

(1) Numerical Limits:

The WLAs are expressed as numerical receiving water limits in stream for Toxicity, Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon within the Calleguas Creek watershed, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon's watershed. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees (Ventura County Watershed Protection District, County of Ventura, and the Cities of Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks) are the following (see Table 14 and Table 15):

Table 14. Receiving water interim limits, in effect until March 24, 2008:

Constituent	Acute (1-hour average)	Chronic (4-day average)
Chlorpyrifos		0.45
Diazinon	1.73	0.556

Table 15. Receiving water final limits, effective March 24, 2008:

Constituent	Acute (1-hour average)	Chronic (4-day average)
Chlorpyrifos (ug/L)		0.014
Diazinon (ug/L)	0.1	0.1

Toxicity 1.0 TUc

The toxicity receiving water limit will be implemented as a trigger mechanism for initiation of the TRE/TIE process as outlined in Calleguas Creek Watershed TMDL Monitoring Program.

Compliance with the numeric WLAs will be determined through receiving water monitoring at the base of each subwatershed defined in the TMDL and outlined in the MRP.

4. Watershed – Pollutant

Calleguas Creek, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon-Organochlorine (OC) Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB), and Siltation.

(a) WLA Implementation

(1) Numerical Limits:

The WLAs are expressed as annual average numerical receiving water limits in-sediment for Organochlorine (OC) Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls

(PCB) and Siltation within the Calleguas Creek watershed, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon's watershed. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees (Ventura County Watershed Protection District, County of Ventura, and the Cities of Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks) are the following (see Table 16):

Table 16. Annual average interim limits, measured at the base of each subwatershed shown in the table below, in effect until March 24, 2026:

Annual Average OC Pesticides and PCBs (ng/g) in-sediment

Constituent	Mugu Lagoon	Calleguas Creek	Revolon Slough	Arroyo Las Posas	Arroyo Simi	Conejo Creek
Chlordane	25	17	48	3.3	3.3	3.4
4,4-DDD	69	66	400	290	14	5.3
4,4-DDE	300	470	1600	950	170	20
4,4-DDT	39	110	690	670	25	2.0
Dieldrin	19	3.0	5.7	1.1	1.1	3.0
PCBs	180	3800	7600	25,700	25,700	3800
Toxaphene	22,900	260	790	230	230	260

Final WLAs are not effective until March 24, 2026. That is longer than the length of this permit. Therefore, final WLAs are not included as numerical limits in this permit. Compliance with the numeric WLAs will be determined through receiving water monitoring at the base of each subwatershed defined in the TMDL and outlined in the MRP.

Siltation Limit

Effective March 24, 2015

Reduction of 2496 tons/yr from baseline to be determined by a special study (see Attachment F Part D.4.1.b).

Attachment F- Monitoring Program

D. TMDL Monitoring and Implementation

This Monitoring section incorporates the TMDL MS4 Waste Load Allocations (WLAs) that have been adopted by the Regional Water board and have been approved by the Office of Administrative Law and the U.S. EPA.

- See Part 6-Total Maximum Daily Load Provisions for ~~prohibition field screening criteria and for~~ WLAs.
- See section E. Federal, State and Regional Regulations #13 for effective dates.
- ~~All Mass Emission monitoring shall be conducted in accordance with the Mass Emission sections' A.3., A.5., A.6, and A.7.~~

- ~~Grab samples shall be taken for pathogen indicators.~~
- ~~Samples for toxicity are to be flow-weighted composites and can be collected manually or automatically (see section A.6 and A.7).~~
- ~~*Ceriodaphnia dubia* (water flea) 7-day survival/reproduction tests shall be used for toxicity testing.~~
- ~~Monitoring results for each TMDL shall be sent electronically to the Regional Board's Storm Water Site at MS4stormwaterrb4@waterboards.ca.gov, no later than 45 days from sample collection date. The sample data transmitted shall be in the Southern California Municipal Storm Water Monitoring Coalition's (SMC) Standardized Data Transfer Formats (SDTFs) and its updates.~~
- ~~A summary of the years' monitoring results for each TMDL with corresponding sampling dates and ToxCale output (if applicable) shall be included in the Annual Monitoring Report.~~

2. Watershed – Pollutant

Santa Clara River and its Tributaries (Reach 3) – Nitrogen Compounds (Ammonia and Nitrate plus Nitrite)

(a) WLA Implementation

The WLAs are expressed as numerical receiving water limits for Ammonia and Nitrate plus Nitrite within Reach 3 of the Santa Clara River. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees (Ventura County Watershed Protection District and the Cities of Santa Paula and Fillmore) are to be implemented through the following:

- (1) Participation in the Santa Clara River Watershed TMDL Monitoring Program.
- (2) Develop and submit a workplan to estimate ammonia and nitrogen loadings associated with runoff loads from the storm drain system. The workplan will include a phased approach wherein the first phase uses monitoring from the existing mass emission station in the Santa Clara River. The workplan will include a protocol for implementing additional monitoring, source identification, and BMPs if necessary in coordination with the requirements in this order. (See Implementation item 5 in the Santa Clara Nitrogen Compounds TMDL Implementation Schedule)

2. Watershed – Pollutant

Malibu Creek and Lagoon - Bacteria

(a) WLA Implementation

The WLAs are expressed as exceedances days in-stream for Bacteria within the Malibu Creek and Lagoon watershed. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees are to be implemented through the following:

- (1) Participation in the Malibu Creek TMDL Monitoring Program.
- (2) Provide a written report describing how the MS4 permittees plan to achieve compliance with the TMDL. The report shall include implementation methods, an implementation schedule, and proposed

milestones. (See Implementation Item 2 in the Malibu Creek Bacteria Implementation Schedule)

3. Watershed – Pollutant

Calleguas Creek, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon-Toxicity, Chlorpyrifos, and Diazinon.

(a) WLA Implementation

The WLAs are expressed as numerical receiving water limits for Toxicity, Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon within the Calleguas Creek watershed. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees (Ventura County Watershed Protection District, County of Ventura, and the Cities of Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks) are to be implemented through the following:

- (1) Participation in the Calleguas Creek Watershed TMDL Monitoring Program (CCWTMP).
- (2) Conduct Special Study #1-Investigation of replacement pesticides and submit results of study by March 24, 2008. (See Implementation Item 5 in the Calleguas Creek Toxicity TMDL Implementation Schedule)
- (3) Develop and implement a collection and disposal program for diazinon and chlorpyrifos, including an outreach and education program by March 24, 2009. This TMDL requirement may be fulfilled through the BMPs described in the Public Information and Participation Program. (See Implementation Item 7 in the Calleguas Creek Toxicity TMDL Implementation Schedule)

4. Watershed – Pollutant

Calleguas Creek, its Tributaries and Mugu Lagoon-Organochlorine (OC) Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB), and Siltation.

(a) WLA Implementation

The WLAs are expressed as annual average numerical receiving water limits in-sediment for Organochlorine (OC) Pesticides, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB) and Siltation within the Calleguas Creek watershed. The limits established for its MS4 Permittees (Ventura County Watershed Protection District, County of Ventura, and the Cities of Camarillo, Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks) are to be implemented through the following:

- (1) Participation in the Calleguas Creek Watershed TMDL Monitoring Program (CCWTMP).
- (2) Participation in the development and conduct of Special Study #1-Sediment transport and sedimentation and submit results of study by March 24, 2014. (See Implementation Item 7 in the Calleguas Creek OC Pesticide TMDL Implementation Schedule)
- (3) Participation in the development and conduct of Special Study #2-Identification of High Concentration Areas and Evaluation of Flood Control Practices and submit results of study by March 24, 2011(See Implementation Item 8 in the Calleguas Creek OC Pesticide TMDL Implementation Schedule)

- (4) Participation in the development and conduct of Special Study #3- Evaluation of natural attenuation rates and submit results of study by March 24, 2016. (See Implementation Item 16 in the Calleguas Creek OC Pesticide TMDL Implementation Schedule)

Develop and implement a collection and disposal program for OC pesticides, including an outreach and education program by March 24, 2011. This TMDL requirement may be fulfilled through the BMPs described in the Public Information and Participation Program. (See Implementation Item 5 in the Calleguas Creek OC Pesticide TMDL Implementation Schedule).