To: Schwab, Kay[Schwab.Kay@epa.gov]
From: Chen, Isaac
Sent: Tue 3/8/2016 8:24:51 PM
Subject: RE: Meet ONE more time to wrap-up LOOP (LA0049492) ?!

Kay,

I will take a look tomorrow, hopefully. Thanks.

Isaac

From: Schwab, Kay
Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2016 1:15 PM
To: Chen, Isaac <Chen.Isaac@epa.gov>; Shaikh, Taimur <Shaikh.Taimur@epa.gov>; Kaspar, Paul <kaspar.paul@epa.gov>
Subject: Meet ONE more time to wrap-up LOOP (LA0049492) ?!

Hello All,

See messages below from 1) Sonja re: permit modifications requested by LOOP (Isaac, it sounds like LDEQ is relying on EPA to address federal waters), and 2) Paul's feedback from LDEQ re: sampling done by LOOP @ "004" (brine discharge).

Please let me know when we can get together for 30 minutes (or less, if possible) later this week. Would Thursday afternoon (btwn 2-4 pm??) work for everyone? If not please, propose other available times.

I have attached pertinent info:

1) email & permit mod. letter,

2) email & 004 data,

3) email & 004 lab reports

We need to decide timeframe for mod. & hash out "004" (i.e., Do we want permit to monitor (when discharging) boron, manganese, zinc, others?? in lieu of biomonitoring? Are metals/other data false highs due to matrix interf.? Do we need to send to EPA Houston lab to ensure "good science?

OR

Is status quo @ "004" good? (i.e., monitor flow, TDS, chloride. O&G limits 10/15, pH 6-9)

I checked EDMS and there were several "004" discharges during 2015…at least quarterly or more often….generally ranging from 50,000 – 5,000,000 barrels over various time periods (days to weeks).

Let me know if you need any additional info.

Thanks

K

*****

Hello Kay,

I recall that LOOP requested the following modifications:

1. Add a new outfall (Outfall 029) for reverse osmosis reject water from the Control Platform at the Marine Terminal.
2. Change the monitoring frequency for TRC at Outfall 015 from 1/week to 1/month to be consistent with other parameters.
3. Remove the biomonitoring requirements for Outfall 004.

In response to your second question, the original cover letter for the draft permit package was signed by Claudia Hosch on or about July 7, 2014. So, yes, it will need to be re-submitted for Stacey's signature.

Sonja

From: Kaspar, Paul
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 3:51 PM
To: Schwab, Kay <Schwab.Kay@epa.gov>
Subject: Found my note from Conversation with Jenniffer Sheppard on LOOP from a couple weeks ago

In order to dilute 168Kppm salinity to perform test, lab had to dilute 500x

Doing so made it difficult to achieve MQL

Similar issue as with LAG26

Including language in permit to use site specific MQL to evaluate MQL

Site specific MQL = 3.3 x lab Reporting Limit

If lab result less than SS MQL, then did not evaluate for WQBEL

Following that process, there was not a need to establish any type of WQBEL

I said I thought there were a couple metals that seemed high

Jenniffer mentioned boron and manganese, but stated that metals were falsely high due to matrix interference

Jenniffer asked if there were any parameters we were interested in having a reporting requirement on to help establish any future permit conditions.

At that time I told her we were still to look closely at info and would have to get back with her.

Paul Kaspar

Chief, NPDES Management Section (6WQ-PO)

NPDES Permits & TMDL Branch

Water Quality Protection Division

US. EPA - Region 6

1445 Ross Avenue

Dallas, TX 75202

Office: 214.665.7459

Fax: 214.665.2191

Email: kaspar.paul@epa.gov