

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

11020 Sun Center Drive, #200 Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114  
Phone (916) 464-3291 • Fax (916) 464-4645  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

**ORDER R5-2015-0029  
NPDES NO. CA0077828**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE NEVADA COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1  
LAKE WILDWOOD WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT  
NEVADA COUNTY**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements (WDR's) set forth in this Order:

**Table 1. Discharger Information**

<b>Discharger</b>	Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant
<b>Facility Address</b>	12622 Pleasant Valley Road
	Penn Valley, CA 95946
	Nevada County

**Table 2. Discharge Location**

<b>Discharge Point</b>	<b>Effluent Description</b>	<b>Discharge Point Latitude (North)</b>	<b>Discharge Point Longitude (West)</b>	<b>Receiving Water</b>
001	Treated Municipal Wastewater	39° 14' 0"	121° 13' 22"	Deer Creek

**Table 3. Administrative Information**

This Order was adopted on:	<b>17 April 2015</b>
This Order shall become effective on:	<b>1 June 2015</b>
This Order shall expire on:	<b>31 May 2020</b>
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as an application for reissuance of WDR's in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than:	<b>180 days prior to the Order expiration date</b>
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region have classified this discharge as follows:	Minor

I, Pamela C. Creedon, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **17 April 2015**.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PAMELA C. CREEDON**, Executive Officer

**CONTENTS**

I. Facility Information .....3  
 II. Findings .....3  
 III. Discharge Prohibitions .....4  
 IV. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications .....4  
     A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 .....4  
         1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 .....4  
         2. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable .....5  
     B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable .....5  
     C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable .....5  
 V. Receiving Water Limitations .....5  
     A. Surface Water Limitations .....5  
     B. Groundwater Limitations – Not Applicable .....7  
 VI. Provisions .....7  
     A. Standard Provisions .....7  
     B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements .....11  
     C. Special Provisions .....11  
         1. Reopener Provisions .....11  
         2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements .....12  
         3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention .....13  
         4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications .....14  
         5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW's Only) .....15  
         6. Other Special Provisions .....16  
         7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable .....16  
 VII. Compliance Determination .....16

**TABLES**

Table 1. Discharger Information .....1  
 Table 2. Discharge Location .....1  
 Table 3. Administrative Information .....1  
 Table 4. Effluent Limitations .....4

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A – Definitions .....A-1  
 Attachment B – Map .....B-1  
 Attachment C – Flow Schematic .....C-1  
 Attachment D – Standard Provisions .....D-1  
 Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program .....E-1  
 Attachment F – Fact Sheet .....F-1  
 Attachment G – Summary Of Reasonable Potential Analysis .....G-1  
 Attachment H – Calculation of WQBEL'S .....H-1

## I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1, Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility's permit application.

## II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Central Valley Water Board), finds:

- A. Legal Authorities.** This Order serves as WDR's pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this Facility to surface waters.
- B. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Central Valley Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order, is hereby incorporated into and constitutes Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G through H are also incorporated into this Order.
- C. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, and V.B are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- D. Monitoring and Reporting.** Section 122.48 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) is provided in Attachment E.

The technical and monitoring reports in this Order are required in accordance with Water Code section 13267, which states the following in subsection (b)(1), *"In conducting an investigation specified in subdivision (a), the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region, or any citizen or domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge, waste outside of its region could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports."*

The Discharger owns and operates the Facility subject to this Order. The monitoring reports required by this Order are necessary to determine compliance with this Order. The need for the monitoring reports is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

- E. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Central Valley Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.
- F. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Central Valley Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R5-2009-0004 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Central Valley Water Board from taking enforcement action for past violations of the previous Order.

**III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS**

- A.** Discharge of wastewater from the Facility, as the Facility is specifically described in the Fact Sheet in section II.B, in a manner different from that described in this Order is prohibited.
- B.** The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C.** Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in section 13050 of the Water Code.
- D.** The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the treatment or disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.

**IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS**

**A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001**

**1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001**

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (except for total coliform organisms, which shall be measured at Monitoring Location UVS-002) as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E:

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 4:

**Table 4. Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	58	86	115	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	58	86	115	--	--
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>						
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.8	3.9	--	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	10	22	--	--	--
Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	10	20	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.69 million gallons per day (MGD).

- b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.
- c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
  - i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
  - ii. 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.
- d. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:
  - i. 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median;
  - ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and
  - iii. 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.
- e. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 0.69 MGD.
- f. **Mercury, Total.** The total annual mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.025 pounds/year for a calendar year.

**2. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable**

**B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable**

**C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable**

**V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

**A. Surface Water Limitations**

The discharge shall not cause the following in Deer Creek:

- 1. **Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than 10 percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
- 2. **Biostimulatory Substances.** Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 3. **Chemical Constituents.** Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 4. **Color.** Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

5. **Dissolved Oxygen:**
  - a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass;
  - b. The 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor
  - c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time.
6. **Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. **Oil and Grease.** Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.
9. **Pesticides:**
  - a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
  - b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
  - c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by U.S. EPA or the Executive Officer;
  - d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 C.F.R. section 131.12.);
  - e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable;
  - f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCL's) set forth in California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, division 4, chapter 15; nor
  - g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.
10. **Radioactivity:**
  - a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
  - b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the MCL's specified in Table 64442 of section 64442 and Table 64443 of section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
11. **Suspended Sediments.** The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
12. **Settleable Substances.** Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

13. **Suspended Material.** Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
14. **Taste and Odors.** Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
15. **Temperature.** The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F. Compliance to be determined based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. A one-month averaging period may be used to determine compliance, as specified in section VII.G, One-month Averaging Periods for Receiving Water Limitations, of this Order.
16. **Toxicity.** Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
17. **Turbidity:**
  - a. Shall not exceed 2 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU;
  - b. Shall not increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs;
  - c. Shall not increase more than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs;
  - d. Shall not increase more than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs; nor
  - e. Shall not increase more than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

When treated wastewater is in compliance with the Filtration System Operating Specifications in section VI.C.4.a, a one-month averaging period may be used when determining compliance with the turbidity receiving water limitation. If the treated wastewater is not in compliance with section VI.C.4.a, then an averaging period is not allowed.

**B. Groundwater Limitations – Not Applicable**

**VI. PROVISIONS**

**A. Standard Provisions**

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:
  - a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, division 3, chapter 26.
  - b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:
    - i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;

- ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;
- iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and
- iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

- i. *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under section 405(d) of the CWA, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.
- ii. *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.
- iii. *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 C.F.R. section 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

The Central Valley Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Central Valley Water Board's own motion.

- c. If a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any scheduled compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under section 307(a) of the CWA, or amendments thereto, for a toxic pollutant that is present in the discharge authorized herein, and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in this Order, the Central Valley Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards and prohibitions within the time provided in the regulations that establish those standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified.

- d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
  - i. Contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or
  - ii. Controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

The Order, as modified or reissued under this paragraph, shall also contain any other requirements of the CWA then applicable.

- e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.
- f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the State or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include such accelerated or additional monitoring as necessary to determine the nature and impact of the non-complying discharge or sludge use or disposal.

- g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by U.S. EPA under section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.
- h. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
- i. Safeguard to electric power failure:
  - i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.
  - ii. Upon written request by the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
  - iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Central Valley Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Central Valley Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Central Valley Water Board and U.S. EPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Central Valley Water Board, become a condition of this Order.
- j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under the Central Valley Water Board Standard Provision contained in section VI.A.2.i of this Order.

The technical report shall:

- i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.
- iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Central Valley Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to

minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

- k. A publicly owned treatment works (POTW) whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Central Valley Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.
- l. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with Title 16, CCR, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.
- m. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- n. For POTW's, prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a permanent decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. (Water Code section 1211).
- o. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board.

To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the state of incorporation if a corporation, address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Central Valley Water Board and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory and certification requirements in the federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D, section V.B) and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

- p. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.
- q. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation of this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by telephone (916) 464-3291 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless the Central Valley Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall state the nature, time, duration, and cause of noncompliance, and shall describe the measures being taken to remedy the current noncompliance and prevent recurrence including, where applicable, a schedule of implementation. Other noncompliance requires written notification as above at the time of the normal monitoring report.

## **B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements**

The Discharger shall comply with the MRP, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E.

## **C. Special Provisions**

### **1. Reopener Provisions**

- a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 C.F.R. section 122.62, including, but not limited to:
  - i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.
  - ii. When new information that was not available at the time of permit issuance would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
- b. This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not limited to, fish tissue sampling, whole effluent toxicity, monitoring requirements on internal waste stream(s), and monitoring for surrogate parameters. Additional requirements may be included in this Order as a result of the special condition monitoring data.
- c. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and the mass effluent limitation modified (higher or lower) or an effluent concentration limitation imposed. If the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the mercury mass loading limitation(s) and the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a numeric or narrative chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control

provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on the new provisions.

- e. **Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
  - f. **Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection Operating Specifications.** The UV operating specifications in this Order are based on the UV guidelines developed by the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) and American Water Works Association Research Foundation (AWWARF) titled "*Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse*". If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV engineering study that identifies site-specific UV operating specifications that will achieve the virus inactivation equivalent to Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water, this Order may be reopened to modify the UV operating specifications.
- 2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements**
- a. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Requirements.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, as specified in MRP section V. Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, or conduct a toxicity evaluation study approved by the Executive Officer, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent recurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. During the end of 2014, the discharge experienced intermittent and low level effluent chronic toxicity for *Selenastrum capriacornutum*. The Discharger initiated a TRE that is still in progress. If after completion of this TRE and (if possible) implementation of corrective actions the toxicity reoccurs, the Discharger may conduct a toxicity evaluation study, individually or as part of a coordinated group effort with other dischargers, that evaluates low level and intermittent toxicity in effluent disinfected by an ultraviolet system. Information on approved toxicity evaluation studies conducted within the Central Valley Region are provided in the Fact Sheet. This Provision includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation, or Toxicity Evaluation Study.
    - i. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications or conduct a toxicity evaluation study approved by the Executive Officer. If the Discharger pursues conducting accelerated monitoring, then the Discharger

shall initiate a TRE or a toxicity evaluation study to address effluent toxicity if any WET testing results exceed the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring.

- ii. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger to initiate a TRE is  $>1$  TUc (where TUc = 100/NOEC). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE.
- iii. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring or submit a toxicity evaluation study workplan within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the exceedance. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four chronic toxicity tests conducted once every two weeks using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:
  - (a) If the results of four consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.
  - (b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (e.g., temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.
  - (c) If the result of any accelerated toxicity test exceeds the monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and begin a TRE or a toxicity evaluation study to investigate the cause(s) of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. Within thirty (30) days of notification by the laboratory of any test result exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan or a toxicity evaluation study workplan to the Central Valley Water Board. The TRE Action Plan shall, at minimum, include:
    - (1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including a TRE WET monitoring schedule;
    - (2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
    - (3) A schedule for these actions.

The Discharger submitted an update to their TRE Workplan on 10 December 2014; therefore, a new TRE Workplan is not required as part of this Order.

### 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger shall update and continue to implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to identify and

address sources of salinity from the Facility. The updated plan shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board **within 9 months** of the effective date of this Order. The Discharger shall provide annual reports demonstrating reasonable progress in the implementation of the salinity evaluation and minimization plan. The annual reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, section IX.D.1).

#### 4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Filtration System Operating Specifications.** To ensure the filtration system is operating properly to provide adequate disinfection of the wastewater, the turbidity of the filter effluent measured at Monitoring Location FIL-001 shall not exceed:
  - i. 2 NTU as a daily average;
  - ii. 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period; and
  - iii. 10 NTU, at any time.
- b. **Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection System Operating Specifications.** The UV disinfection system must be operated in accordance with an operations and maintenance program that assures adequate disinfection, and shall meet the following minimum specifications to provide virus inactivation equivalent to Title 22 Disinfected Tertiary Recycled Water:
  - i. **UV Dose.** The minimum hourly average UV dose in the UV reactor shall be 100 millijoules per square centimeter ( $\text{mJ}/\text{cm}^2$ ).
  - ii. **UV Transmittance.** The minimum hourly average UV transmittance (at 254 nanometers) in the wastewater measured at Monitoring Location UVS-001 shall not fall below 55 percent.
  - iii. The lamp sleeves and cleaning system components must be visually inspected per the manufacturer's operations manual for physical wear (scoring, solarization, seal leaks, cleaning fluid levels, etc.) and to check the efficacy of the cleaning system.
  - iv. The lamp sleeves must be cleaned periodically as necessary to meet the UV dose requirements.
  - v. Lamps must be replaced per the manufacturer's operations manual, or sooner, if there are indications the lamps are failing to provide adequate disinfection. Lamp age and lamp replacement records must be maintained.
- c. **Emergency Storage Pond Operating Requirements**
  - i. The treatment facilities and emergency storage pond shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
  - ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
  - iii. The emergency storage pond shall be used only to prevent discharge of wastewater that does not meet effluent limits, to store partially treated wastewater, or to prevent upsets by diverting influent that would be harmful to the treatment process.
  - iv. Freeboard in the emergency storage pond shall not be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow), except if lesser freeboard does not threaten the integrity of the pond, no overflow of the pond occurs, and

lesser freeboard is due to direct precipitation or storm water runoff occurring as a result of annual precipitation with greater than a 100-year recurrence interval, or a storm event with an intensity greater than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.

- v. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger).

## 5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW's Only)

- a. **Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications.** Sludge in this document means the solid, semisolid, and liquid residues removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment processes. Solid waste refers to grit and screening material generated during preliminary treatment. Residual sludge means sludge that will not be subject to further treatment at the wastewater treatment plant. Biosolids refer to sludge that has been treated and tested and shown to be capable of being beneficially and legally used pursuant to federal and state regulations as a soil amendment for agricultural, silvicultural, horticultural, and land reclamation activities as specified under 40 C.F.R. part 503.

- i. Collected screenings, residual sludge, biosolids, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer, and consistent with Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing, or Disposal of Solid Waste, as set forth in Title 27, CCR, division 2, subdivision 1, section 20005, et seq. Removal for further treatment, storage, disposal, or reuse at sites (e.g., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid WDR's issued by a Regional Water Board will satisfy these specifications.

Sludge and solid waste shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, clarifiers, etc. as needed to ensure optimal plant performance.

The treatment of sludge generated at the Facility shall be confined to the Facility property and conducted in a manner that precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations in section V.B of this Order. In addition, the storage of residual sludge, solid waste, and biosolids on Facility property shall be temporary and controlled, and contained in a manner that minimizes leachate formation and precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations included in section V.B of this Order.

- ii. The use, disposal, storage, and transportation of biosolids shall comply with existing federal and state laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 C.F.R. part 503. If the State Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 C.F.R. part 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 C.F.R. part 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.
- iii. The Discharger shall comply with Section IX.A Biosolids of the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E.

- iv. Any proposed change in biosolids use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and U.S. EPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.
- v. The Discharger shall maintain a biosolids use or disposal plan that describes at a minimum:
  - (a) Sources and amounts of biosolids generated annually.
  - (b) Location(s) of on-site storage and description of the containment area.
  - (c) Plans for ultimate disposal. For landfill disposal, include the present classification of the landfill; and the name and location of the landfill.
- b. **Collection System.** On 2 May 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDR's for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order 2006-0003-DWQ and any future revisions thereto. Order 2006-0003-DWQ requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the general WDR's. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under Order 2006-0003-DWQ for operation of its wastewater collection system.
- c. **Anaerobically Digestible Material.** If the Discharger proposes to receive hauled-in anaerobically digestible material for injection into an anaerobic digester for co-digestion, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board and develop and implement standard operating procedures (SOP's) for this activity prior to initiation of the hauling. The SOP's shall address material handling, including unloading, screening, or other processing prior to anaerobic digestion; transportation; spill prevention; and spill response. In addition, the SOP's shall address avoidance of the introduction of materials that could cause interference, pass-through, or upset of the treatment processes; avoidance of prohibited material, vector control, odor control, operation and maintenance, and the disposition of any solid waste segregated from introduction to the digester. The Discharger shall provide training to its staff on the SOP's and shall maintain records for a minimum of three years for each load received, describing the hauler, waste type, and quantity received. In addition, the Discharger shall maintain records for a minimum of three years for the disposition, location, and quantity of accumulated pre-digestion-segregated solid waste hauled off-site.

## 6. Other Special Provisions

- a. **Title 22, or Equivalent, Disinfection Requirements.** Wastewater shall be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to the Department of Drinking Water (DDW) reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3, (Title 22), or equivalent.

## 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

## VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

- A. **BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS Effluent Limitations (Sections IV.A.1.a and IV.A.1.b).** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.b for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic

mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

**B. Total Mercury Mass Loading Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.f).** The procedures for calculating mass loadings are as follows:

1. The total pollutant mass load for each individual quarter shall be determined using an average of all concentration data collected that quarter and the corresponding total quarterly flow. All effluent monitoring data collected under the monitoring and reporting program and any special studies shall be used for these calculations. The total annual mass loading shall be the sum of loadings for the four annual quarters.
2. In calculating compliance, the Discharger shall count all non-detect measures at one-half of the detection level. If compliance with the effluent limitation is not attained due to the non-detect contribution, the Discharger shall improve and implement available analytical capabilities and compliance shall be evaluated with consideration of the detection limits.

**C. Average Dry Weather Flow Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.e).** The average dry weather flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the average dry weather flow effluent limitations will be determined annually based on the average daily flow over three consecutive dry weather months (e.g., July, August, and September).

**D. Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.d).** For each day that an effluent sample is collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms, the 7-day median shall be determined by calculating the median concentration of total coliform bacteria in the effluent utilizing the bacteriological results of the last 7 days. For example, if a sample is collected on a Wednesday, the result from that sampling event and all results from the previous 6 days (i.e., Tuesday, Monday, Sunday, Saturday, Friday, and Thursday) are used to calculate the 7-day median. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a most probable number (MPN) of 2.2 per 100 milliliters, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance.

**E. Mass Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.a).** The mass effluent limitations contained in the Final Effluent Limitations IV.A.1.a are based on the permitted average dry weather flow and calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34 \text{ (conversion factor)}$$

If the effluent flow exceeds the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations contained in Final Effluent Limitations IV.A.1.a shall not apply. If the effluent flow is below the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations do apply.

**F. Priority Pollutant Effluent Limitations.** Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants shall be determined in accordance with section 2.4.5 of the SIP, as follows:

1. Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reporting level (RL).
2. Dischargers shall be required to conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) in accordance with section 2.4.5.1 of the SIP when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:
  - a. A sample result is reported as detected, but not quantified (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or
  - b. A sample result is reported as non-detect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL).

3. When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) or average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL) and more than one sample result is available in a month or week, respectively; the discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
    - i. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
    - ii. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
  4. If a sample result, or the arithmetic mean or median of multiple sample results, is below the RL, and there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and the discharger conducts a PMP (as described in section 2.4.5.1), the discharger shall not be deemed out of compliance.
- G. One-month Averaging Period for Receiving Water Limitations (Section V.A).** The (temperature or turbidity) sample values shall be collected as specified in Attachment E (Monitoring and Reporting Program). The sample values collected for the calendar month at Monitoring Location RSW-001 shall be added together and the total divided by the number of sample values. The sample values collected for the calendar month at Monitoring Location RSW-002 shall be added together and the total divided by the number of sample values. The difference between the two averages may then be calculated and used to satisfy the one-month averaging period allowance.

## ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

### Arithmetic Mean ( $\mu$ )

Also called the average, is the sum of measured values divided by the number of samples. For ambient water concentrations, the arithmetic mean is calculated as follows:

Arithmetic mean =  $\mu = \Sigma x / n$                       where:  $\Sigma x$  is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and  $n$  is the number of samples.

### Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

### Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar week (Sunday through Saturday), calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar week divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that week.

### Bioaccumulative

Those substances taken up by an organism from its surrounding medium through gill membranes, epithelial tissue, or from food and subsequently concentrated and retained in the body of the organism.

### Carcinogenic

Pollutants are substances that are known to cause cancer in living organisms.

### Coefficient of Variation (CV)

CV is a measure of the data variability and is calculated as the estimated standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean of the observed values.

### Daily Discharge

Daily Discharge is defined as either: (1) the total mass of the constituent discharged over the calendar day (12:00 am through 11:59 pm) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling (as specified in the permit), for a constituent with limitations expressed in units of mass or; (2) the unweighted arithmetic mean measurement of the constituent over the day for a constituent with limitations expressed in other units of measurement (e.g., concentration).

The daily discharge may be determined by the analytical results of a composite sample taken over the course of one day (a calendar day or other 24-hour period defined as a day) or by the arithmetic mean of analytical results from one or more grab samples taken over the course of the day.

For composite sampling, if 1 day is defined as a 24-hour period other than a calendar day, the analytical result for the 24-hour period will be considered as the result for the calendar day in which the 24-hour period ends.

### Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

DNQ are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL. Sample results reported as DNQ are estimated concentrations.

### Dilution Credit

Dilution Credit is the amount of dilution granted to a discharge in the calculation of a water quality-based effluent limitation, based on the allowance of a specified mixing zone. It is calculated from the dilution ratio or determined through conducting a mixing zone study or modeling of the discharge and receiving water.

### **Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)**

ECA is a value derived from the water quality criterion/objective, dilution credit, and ambient background concentration that is used, in conjunction with the coefficient of variation for the effluent monitoring data, to calculate a long-term average (LTA) discharge concentration. The ECA has the same meaning as waste load allocation (WLA) as used in U.S. EPA guidance (Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control, March 1991, second printing, EPA/505/2-90-001).

### **Enclosed Bays**

Enclosed Bays means indentations along the coast that enclose an area of oceanic water within distinct headlands or harbor works. Enclosed bays include all bays where the narrowest distance between the headlands or outermost harbor works is less than 75 percent of the greatest dimension of the enclosed portion of the bay. Enclosed bays include, but are not limited to, Humboldt Bay, Bodega Harbor, Tomales Bay, Drake's Estero, San Francisco Bay, Morro Bay, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Upper and Lower Newport Bay, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay. Enclosed bays do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

### **Estimated Chemical Concentration**

The estimated chemical concentration that results from the confirmed detection of the substance by the analytical method below the ML value.

### **Estuaries**

Estuaries means waters, including coastal lagoons, located at the mouths of streams that serve as areas of mixing for fresh and ocean waters. Coastal lagoons and mouths of streams that are temporarily separated from the ocean by sandbars shall be considered estuaries. Estuarine waters shall be considered to extend from a bay or the open ocean to a point upstream where there is no significant mixing of fresh water and seawater. Estuarine waters included, but are not limited to, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, as defined in Water Code section 12220, Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait downstream to the Carquinez Bridge, and appropriate areas of the Smith, Mad, Eel, Noyo, Russian, Klamath, San Diego, and Otay rivers. Estuaries do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

### **Inland Surface Waters**

All surface waters of the state that do not include the ocean, enclosed bays, or estuaries.

### **Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation**

The highest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous maximum limitation).

### **Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation**

The lowest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous minimum limitation).

### **Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)**

The highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.

### **Median**

The middle measurement in a set of data. The median of a set of data is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of

measurements (n) is odd, then the median =  $X_{(n+1)/2}$ . If n is even, then the median =  $(X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1})/2$  (i.e., the midpoint between the n/2 and n/2+1).

### **Method Detection Limit (MDL)**

MDL is the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

### **Minimum Level (ML)**

ML is the concentration at which the entire analytical system must give a recognizable signal and acceptable calibration point. The ML is the concentration in a sample that is equivalent to the concentration of the lowest calibration standard analyzed by a specific analytical procedure, assuming that all the method specified sample weights, volumes, and processing steps have been followed.

### **Mixing Zone**

Mixing Zone is a limited volume of receiving water that is allocated for mixing with a wastewater discharge where water quality criteria can be exceeded without causing adverse effects to the overall water body.

### **Not Detected (ND)**

Sample results which are less than the laboratory's MDL.

### **Ocean Waters**

The territorial marine waters of the State as defined by California law to the extent these waters are outside of enclosed bays, estuaries, and coastal lagoons. Discharges to ocean waters are regulated in accordance with the State Water Board's California Ocean Plan.

### **Persistent Pollutants**

Persistent pollutants are substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

### **Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)**

PMP means waste minimization and pollution prevention actions that include, but are not limited to, product substitution, waste stream recycling, alternative waste management methods, and education of the public and businesses. The goal of the PMP shall be to reduce all potential sources of a priority pollutant(s) through pollutant minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures as appropriate, to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the water quality-based effluent limitation. Pollution prevention measures may be particularly appropriate for persistent bioaccumulative priority pollutants where there is evidence that beneficial uses are being impacted. The Central Valley Water Board may consider cost effectiveness when establishing the requirements of a PMP. The completion and implementation of a Pollution Prevention Plan, if required pursuant to Water Code section 13263.3(d), shall be considered to fulfill the PMP requirements.

### **Pollution Prevention**

Pollution Prevention means any action that causes a net reduction in the use or generation of a hazardous substance or other pollutant that is discharged into water and includes, but is not limited to, input change, operational improvement, production process change, and product reformulation (as defined in Water Code section 13263.3). Pollution prevention does not include actions that merely shift a pollutant in wastewater from one environmental medium to another environmental medium, unless clear environmental benefits of such an approach are identified to the satisfaction of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) or Central Valley Water Board.

### **Reporting Level (RL)**

The RL is the ML (and its associated analytical method) chosen by the Discharger for reporting and compliance determination from the MLs included in this Order. The MLs included in this Order correspond to approved analytical methods for reporting a sample result that are selected by the Regional Water Board either from Appendix 4 of the SIP in accordance with section 2.4.2 of the SIP or established in accordance with section 2.4.3 of the SIP. The ML is based on the proper application of method-based analytical procedures for sample preparation and the absence of any matrix interferences. Other factors may be applied to the ML depending on the specific sample preparation steps employed. For example, the treatment typically applied in cases where there are matrix-effects is to dilute the sample or sample aliquot by a factor often. In such cases, this additional factor must be applied to the ML in the computation of the RL.

### **Satellite Collection System**

The portion, if any, of a sanitary sewer system owned or operated by a different public agency than the agency that owns and operates the wastewater treatment facility that a sanitary sewer system is tributary to.

### **Source of Drinking Water**

Any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Central Valley Water Board Basin Plan.

### **Standard Deviation ( $\sigma$ )**

Standard Deviation is a measure of variability that is calculated as follows:

$$\sigma = (\sum[(x - \mu)^2]/(n - 1))^{0.5}$$

where:

x is the observed value;

$\mu$  is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and

n is the number of samples.


### **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)**

TRE is a study conducted in a step-wise process designed to identify the causative agents of effluent or ambient toxicity, isolate the sources of toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of toxicity control options, and then confirm the reduction in toxicity. The first steps of the TRE consist of the collection of data relevant to the toxicity, including additional toxicity testing, and an evaluation of facility operations and maintenance practices, and best management practices. A Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) may be required as part of the TRE, if appropriate. (A TIE is a set of procedures to identify the specific chemical(s) responsible for toxicity. These procedures are performed in three phases (characterization, identification, and confirmation) using aquatic organism toxicity tests.)

**ATTACHMENT B – MAP**



ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC



## ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

### I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

#### A. Duty to Comply

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the terms, requirements, and conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action; permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a); Wat. Code, §§ 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 13001, 13304, 13350, 13385.)
2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under Section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1).)

#### B. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense

It shall not be a defense for a Discharger in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c).)

#### C. Duty to Mitigate

The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d).)

#### D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

The Discharger shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the Discharger to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems that are installed by a Discharger only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e).)

#### E. Property Rights

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g).)
2. The issuance of this Order does not authorize any injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations. (40 C.F.R. § 122.5(c).)

#### F. Inspection and Entry

The Discharger shall allow the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, § 13267, 13383):

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3); Wat. Code, § 13267, 13383); and
4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

#### **G. Bypass**

1. Definitions
  - a. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i).)
  - b. "Severe property damage" means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii).)
2. Bypass not exceeding limitations. The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3, I.G.4, and I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2).)
3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Central Valley Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):
  - a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));
  - b. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
  - c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Central Valley Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)

4. The Central Valley Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Central Valley Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)
5. Notice
  - a. Anticipated bypass. If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)
  - b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)

#### **H. Upset**

Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(1).)

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).)
2. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A Discharger who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):
  - a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));
  - b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));
  - c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
  - d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv).)
3. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the Discharger seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(4).)

## **II. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION**

### **A. General**

This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Discharger for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any Order condition. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(f).)

**B. Duty to Reapply**

If the Discharger wishes to continue an activity regulated by this Order after the expiration date of this Order, the Discharger must apply for and obtain a new permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b).)

**C. Transfers**

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Central Valley Water Board. The Central Valley Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and the Water Code. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(3); 122.61.)

**III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING**

- A.** Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1).)
- B.** Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O. In the case of pollutants for which there are no approved methods under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or otherwise required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, monitoring must be conducted according to a test procedure specified in this Order for such pollutants. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(4); 122.44(i)(1)(iv).)

**IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS**

- A.** Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Discharger's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. part 503), the Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2).)
- B.** Records of monitoring information shall include:
  - 1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(i));
  - 2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
  - 3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
  - 4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
  - 5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
  - 6. The results of such analyses. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)
- C.** Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)):
  - 1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(1)); and
  - 2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(2).)

## V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

### A. Duty to Provide Information

The Discharger shall furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

### B. Signatory and Certification Requirements

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k).)
2. All permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of U.S. EPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).)
3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
  - a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
  - b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
  - c. The written authorization is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)
5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

“I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my

inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d).)

**C. Monitoring Reports**

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4).)
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Central Valley Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii).)
4. Calculations for all limitations, which require averaging of measurements, shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii).)

**D. Compliance Schedules**

Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this Order, shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(5).)

**E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting**

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)
2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):
  - a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
  - b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)
3. The Central Valley Water Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii).)

**F. Planned Changes**

The Discharger shall give notice to the Central Valley Water Board as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required under this provision only when (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)):

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in 40 C.F.R. section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or
2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii).)
3. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

**G. Anticipated Noncompliance**

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(2).)

**H. Other Noncompliance**

The Discharger shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.C, V.D, and V.E above at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(7).)

**I. Other Information**

When the Discharger becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8).)

**VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT**

- A. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.

**VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS**

**A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW's)**

All POTW's shall provide adequate notice to the Central Valley Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and
2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2).)

3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3).)

## ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

### Contents

I.	General Monitoring Provisions .....	E-2
II.	Monitoring Locations.....	E-3
III.	Influent Monitoring Requirements .....	E-3
	A. Monitoring Location INF-001 .....	E-3
IV.	Effluent Monitoring Requirements.....	E-4
	A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 .....	E-4
V.	Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements .....	E-5
VI.	Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements.....	E-8
	A. Monitoring Location PND-001.....	E-8
VII.	Recycling Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable .....	E-8
VIII.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements.....	E-8
	A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002 .....	E-8
IX.	Other Monitoring Requirements .....	E-9
	A. Biosolids .....	E-9
	B. Municipal Water Supply .....	E-9
	C. Filtration System and Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection System .....	E-10
	D. Effluent Characterization (2018).....	E-10
X.	Reporting Requirements .....	E-14
	A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements .....	E-14
	B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMR's).....	E-14
	C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's) – Not Applicable.....	E-17
	D. Other Reports .....	E-17

### Tables

Table E-1.	Monitoring Station Locations .....	E-3
Table E-2.	Influent Monitoring.....	E-3
Table E-3.	Effluent Monitoring .....	E-4
Table E-4.	Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series.....	E-6
Table E-5.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements.....	E-8
Table E-6.	Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements .....	E-9
Table E-7.	Filtration System and UV Disinfection System Monitoring Requirements.....	E-10
Table E-8.	Effluent Characterization Monitoring .....	E-10
Table E-9.	Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule.....	E-15
Table E-10.	Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports .....	E-17

## **ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)**

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 C.F.R. § 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and California regulations.

### **I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS**

- A.** Samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. All samples shall be taken at the monitoring locations specified below and, unless otherwise specified, before the monitored flow joins or is diluted by any other waste stream, body of water, or substance. Monitoring locations shall not be changed without notification to and the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
- B.** Effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.
- C.** Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted by a laboratory certified for such analyses by the Department of Drinking Water (DDW). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine, such analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine must be kept onsite in the treatment facility laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Central Valley Water Board staff. The Discharger must demonstrate sufficient capability (qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments, etc.) to adequately perform these field measurements. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to U.S. EPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Central Valley Water Board.
- D.** Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.
- E.** Monitoring results, including noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- F.** Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by DDW, in accordance with the provision of Water Code section 13176, and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports.
- G.** The Discharger shall file with the Central Valley Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- H.** The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board, and shall be submitted in such a format as to allow direct comparison with the

limitations and requirements of this Order. Unless otherwise specified, discharge flows shall be reported in terms of the monthly average and the daily maximum discharge flows.

**II. MONITORING LOCATIONS**

The Discharger shall establish the following monitoring locations to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitations, discharge specifications, and other requirements in this Order:

**Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations**

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	A location where a representative sample of the influent into the Facility can be collected prior to entering the treatment process. Latitude: 39° 14' 2" N, Longitude: 121° 13' 11" W
001	EFF-001	A location where a representative sample of the effluent from the Facility can be collected after all treatment processes and prior to commingling with other waste streams or being discharged to Deer Creek. Latitude: 39° 14' 0" N, Longitude: 121° 13' 22" W
--	RSW-001	In Deer Creek, 850 feet upstream of Discharge Point 001.
--	RSW-002	In Deer Creek, 100 feet downstream of Discharge Point 001.
--	PND-001	Emergency storage pond.
--	BIO-001	A location where a representative sample of the biosolids can be obtained.
--	SPL-001	A location where a representative sample of the municipal water supply can be obtained.
--	FIL-001	Monitoring of the filter effluent to be measured immediately downstream of the filters prior to the ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection system.
--	UVS-001	A location where a representative sample of wastewater can be collected immediately upstream of the UV disinfection system.
--	UVS-002	A location where a representative sample of wastewater can be collected immediately downstream of the UV disinfection system.

The North latitude and West longitude information in Table 1 are approximate for administrative purposes.

**III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Monitoring Location INF-001**

- The Discharger shall monitor influent to the Facility at Monitoring Location INF-001 as follows:

**Table E-2. Influent Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	2/Month	2
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	2/Month	2

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
-----------	-------	-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

<sup>1</sup> 24-hour flow proportional composite.

<sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136; or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

#### IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

##### A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

- The Discharger shall monitor tertiary treated effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as follows. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding Minimum Level:

**Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	1/Week	2
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week	--
pH	standard units	Grab	2/Week <sup>3,4</sup>	2
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	1/Week	2
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week	--
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>				
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	2,5,6
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	See Section IX.D	See Section IX.D	See Section IX.D	2,5
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Week <sup>3,7</sup>	2
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week	--
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	Meter or Grab <sup>8</sup>	1/Day <sup>9</sup>	2
Peracetic Acid	mg/L	Meter or Grab	1/Day <sup>10</sup>	2
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	2
Hardness, Total (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	2
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>11</sup>	2
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>11</sup>	2
Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	Calculate	1/Month	--
Temperature	°C	Grab	2/Week <sup>3,4</sup>	2

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
-----------	-------	-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

- 1 24-hour flow proportional composite.
- 2 Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
- 3 pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.
- 4 A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.
- 5 For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, section IX.D).
- 6 Unfiltered total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2), and shall be analyzed by U.S. EPA method 1630/1631 (Revision E) with a reporting limit of 0.5 ng/L.
- 7 Concurrent with whole effluent toxicity monitoring.
- 8 Chlorine residual monitoring is required at a minimum of once per day when chlorine or chlorine containing products are used for maintenance purposes. The Discharger may conduct continuous monitoring utilizing the existing metering equipment in lieu of the daily grab sample. In addition, if chlorine or chlorine containing products are scheduled to be used for maintenance purposes, the Discharger shall monitor chlorine residual one week prior to use and one week after the end of use.
- 9 Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L. Total chlorine residual monitoring is only required when chlorine or chlorine-containing products are used in the treatment process for maintenance purposes (monitoring is not required for the use of chlorinated potable water for filter backwashing). When chlorine or chlorine-containing products are not in use in the treatment process, the Discharger shall so state in the monthly self-monitoring report.
- 10 Peracetic acid (PAA) residual monitoring is only required when PAA is used in the disinfection process.
- 11 Monitoring for nitrite and nitrate shall be conducted concurrently.

**V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS**

- A. Acute Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing acute toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following acute toxicity testing requirements:
1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform annual acute toxicity testing concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling. The acute and chronic toxicity tests shall be evenly distributed throughout the year.
  2. Sample Types – The Discharger may use flow-through or static renewal testing. For static renewal testing, the samples shall be grab and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001.
  3. Test Species – Test species shall be fathead minnows (*Pimephales promelas*).
  4. Methods – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.
  5. Test Failure – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 14 days following notification of test failure.

**B. Chronic Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct three species chronic toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger is not required to conduct this chronic toxicity testing when the Facility is engaged in a TIE/TRE, or toxicity evaluation study. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform annual three species chronic toxicity testing (The chronic and acute toxicity tests shall be evenly distributed throughout the year).
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be flow proportional 24-hour composites and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from Monitoring Location RSW-001, as identified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
3. Sample Volumes – Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.
4. Test Species – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:
  - a. The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
  - b. The fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (larval survival and growth test); and
  - c. The green alga, *Selenastrum capricornutum* (growth test).
5. Methods – The presence of chronic toxicity shall be estimated as specified in *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002.
6. Reference Toxicant – As required by the SIP, all chronic toxicity tests shall be conducted with concurrent testing with a reference toxicant and shall be reported with the chronic toxicity test results.
7. Dilutions – For routine and accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, it is not necessary to perform the test using a dilution series. The test may be performed using 100% effluent and one control. For Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in the table below, unless an alternative dilution series is detailed in the submitted TRE Action Plan. A receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

**Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series**

Sample	Dilutions <sup>1</sup> (%)					Control
	100	75	50	25	12.5	
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	12.5	0
% Control Water	0	25	50	75	87.5	100

<sup>1</sup> Receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

8. Test Failure – The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than fourteen (14) days after receiving notification of a test failure. A test failure is defined as follows:
  - a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of*

*Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual), and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or*

- b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in Table 6 on page 52 of the Method Manual. (A retest is only required in this case if the test results do not exceed the monitoring trigger specified in the Special Provision at section VI. 2.a.iii of the Order.)
- C. WET Testing Notification Requirements.** The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board within 24-hours after the receipt of test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during regular or accelerated monitoring, or an exceedance of the acute toxicity effluent limitation.
- D. WET Testing Reporting Requirements.** All toxicity test reports shall include the contracting laboratory's complete report provided to the Discharger and shall be in accordance with the appropriate "Report Preparation and Test Review" sections of the method manuals. At a minimum, whole effluent toxicity monitoring shall be reported as follows:
1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Regular chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board within 45 days following completion of the test, and shall contain, at minimum:
    - a. The results expressed in TUC, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as 100/LC50, 100/EC25, 100/IC25, and 100/IC50, as appropriate.
    - b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;
    - c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the percent minimum significant difference (PMSD);
    - d. The dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test; and
    - e. The results compared to the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger.

Additionally, the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports shall contain an updated chronology of chronic toxicity test results expressed in TUC, and organized by test species, type of test (survival, growth or reproduction), and monitoring frequency, i.e., either quarterly, monthly, accelerated, or TRE.
  2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports and reported as percent survival.
  3. **TRE or Toxicity Evaluation Study Reporting.** Reports for TREs or toxicity evaluation study shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved workplan, or as amended by the Discharger's TRE Action Plan.
  4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:
    - a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.
    - b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.
    - c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.

**VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Monitoring Location PND-001**

1. The Discharger shall record the following in a log related to the use of the emergency storage pond when wastewater is directed to the emergency storage pond that has not received tertiary treatment (e.g., raw untreated wastewater or wastewater that has only received primary treatment):
  - a. The date(s) when the wastewater is directed to the pond;
  - b. The type(s) of wastewater (e.g., untreated due to exceeding plant capacity) directed to the pond;
  - c. The total volume of wastewater directed to the pond (may be estimated);
  - d. The duration of time wastewater is collected in the pond prior to redirection back to the wastewater treatment plant;
  - e. The date when all wastewater in the pond has been redirected to the wastewater treatment plant; and
  - f. The freeboard available in the pond.
2. The pond log shall be submitted with the monthly SMR's required in section X.B of this MRP for months in which any type of wastewater is directed to the emergency storage pond. If wastewater is not directed to the emergency storage pond for the entire month it should be noted in the cover letter with the monthly SMR in lieu of submitting the pond log.

**VII. RECYCLING MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE**

**VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002**

1. The Discharger shall monitor Deer Creek at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. Monitoring is not required at RSW-001 when there is no flow present at this location but must be noted in the monthly SMR's. The Discharger shall monitor RSW-001 (when flow is present) and RSW-002 as follows:

**Table E-5. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency <sup>1</sup>	Required Analytical Test Method
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Month	<sup>2</sup>
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	<sup>2</sup>
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	<sup>2</sup>
Hardness, Total (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	<sup>2</sup>
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab	1/Week <sup>3</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/Month	<sup>2</sup>

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency <sup>1</sup>	Required Analytical Test Method
-----------	-------	-------------	-----------------------------------------	---------------------------------

- <sup>1</sup> Monitoring is not required at Monitoring Location RSW-001 when upstream receiving water flow is not present. If upstream receiving water flow is not present, the SMR shall so state.
- <sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
- <sup>3</sup> Temperature monitoring shall be conducted concurrently at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002 and shall be conducted weekly between 12 PM and 6 PM.
2. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. Monitoring is not required at RSW-001 when there is no flow present at this location but must be noted in the monthly SMR's. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:
- Floating or suspended matter;
  - Discoloration;
  - Bottom deposits;
  - Aquatic life;
  - Visible films, sheens, or coatings;
  - Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths;
  - Potential nuisance conditions.

Notes on the receiving water conditions shall be summarized in the monitoring report.

**IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Biosolids**

**1. Monitoring Location BIO-001**

- A composite sample of sludge shall be collected annually at Monitoring Location BIO-001 in accordance with U.S. EPA's *POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document*, August 1989, and tested for the metals listed in Title 22.
- Biosolids monitoring shall be conducted using the methods in *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical methods* (EPA publication SW-846), as required in 40 C.F.R. section 503.8(b)(4). All results must be reported on a 100% dry weight basis. Records of all analyses must state on each page of the laboratory report whether the results are expressed in "100% dry weight" or "as is."
- Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of **5 years**. A log shall be maintained of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log must be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.

**B. Municipal Water Supply**

**1. Monitoring Location SPL-001**

- The Discharger shall monitor the municipal water supply at Monitoring Location SPL-001 as follows.

**Table E-6. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C <sup>1</sup>	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Year	<sup>2</sup>

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
-----------	-------	-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------

- <sup>1</sup> If the water supply is from more than one source, the electrical conductivity shall be reported as a weighted average and include copies of supporting calculations.
- <sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

**C. Filtration System and Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection System**

**1. Monitoring Locations FIL-001, UVS-001, and UVS-002**

- a. The Discharger shall monitor the filtration system and UV disinfection system at Monitoring Locations FIL-001, UVS-001, and UVS-002 as follows:

**Table E-7. Filtration System and UV Disinfection System Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Monitoring Location	Minimum Sampling Frequency
Flow	MGD	Meter	UVS-001	Continuous <sup>1</sup>
Turbidity	NTU	Meter	FIL-001	Continuous <sup>1,2</sup>
UV Transmittance	Percent (%)	Meter	UVS-001	Continuous <sup>1</sup>
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	UVS-002	3/Week

- <sup>1</sup> For continuous analyzers, the Discharger shall report documented routine meter maintenance activities including date, time of day, and duration, in which the analyzer(s) is not in operation. If analyzer(s) fail to provide continuous monitoring for more than two hours and influent and/or effluent from the disinfection process is not diverted for retreatment, the Discharger shall obtain and report hourly manual and/or grab sample results. The Discharger shall not decrease power settings or reduce the number of UV lamp banks in operation while the continuous analyzers are out of service and water is being disinfected.
- <sup>2</sup> Report daily average and maximum turbidity.

**D. Effluent Characterization (2018)**

1. **Semi-Annual Monitoring.** Semi-annual samples shall be collected from the effluent (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table E-8, below. Semi-annual monitoring shall be conducted during 2018 (two samples, evenly distributed throughout the year) and the results of such monitoring be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the monthly self-monitoring reports. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent.
2. **Sample type.** Effluent samples shall be taken as described in Table E-8, below.

**Table E-8. Effluent Characterization Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
2- Chloroethyl vinyl ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Acrolein	µg/L	Grab	2
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Bromoform <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroform <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	Grab	2
Chloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Dibromochloromethane <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	Grab	0.5

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Dichlorobromomethane <sup>2</sup>	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Dichloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	1
Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)	µg/L	Grab	1
Naphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
Parachlorometa cresol	µg/L	Grab	
Tetrachloroethene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Toluene	µg/L	Grab	2
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	1
Trichloroethene	µg/L	Grab	2
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	µg/L	Grab	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichloropropane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichloropropylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
1,2-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,4-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-Benzanthracene	µg/L	Grab	5
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	Grab	1
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	Grab	2
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
3,4-Benzofluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	5
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	5
Acenaphthene	µg/L	Grab	1
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	Grab	10
Anthracene	µg/L	Grab	10
Benzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)	µg/L	Grab	2

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	2
Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	µg/L	Grab	5
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	10
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate <sup>3</sup>	µg/L	Grab	5
Butyl benzyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Chrysene	µg/L	Grab	5
Di-n-butylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Di-n-octylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene	µg/L	Grab	0.1
Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluorene	µg/L	Grab	10
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	Grab	5
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	µg/L	Grab	0.05
Isophorone	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	Grab	10
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Phenanthrene	µg/L	Grab	5
Phenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Pyrene	µg/L	Grab	10
Aluminum	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Antimony	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	5
Arsenic	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	10
Asbestos	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Beryllium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	2
Cadmium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
Chromium (III)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	50
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	10
Copper	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	2
Cyanide	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	5
Iron	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Lead	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
Mercury <sup>5</sup>	ng/L	Grab <sup>6</sup>	0.5
Manganese	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Nickel	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	5
Selenium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	5
Silver	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.25
Thallium	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	1
Zinc	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	20
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.05
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.05
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.02
alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Aldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.005
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.005
Chlordane	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.1
delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.005
Dieldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Endosulfan sulfate	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Endrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Heptachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.01
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.02
Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1016	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1221	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1232	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1242	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1248	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1254	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
PCB-1260	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	0.5
Toxaphene	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Ammonia (as N) <sup>5</sup>	mg/L	Grab	
Boron	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Chloride	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Flow	MGD	Meter	
Hardness (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> ) <sup>5</sup>	mg/L	Grab	
Foaming Agents (MBAS)	µg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Mercury, Methyl	ng/L	Grab <sup>5</sup>	0.05
Nitrate (as N) <sup>5</sup>	mg/L	Grab	
Nitrite (as N) <sup>5</sup>	mg/L	Grab	
pH <sup>5</sup>	Std Units	Grab	
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Specific conductance (EC)	µmhos/cm	Grab	
Sulfate	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Sulfide (as S)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Sulfite (as SO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	
Temperature <sup>5</sup>	°C	Grab	
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>4</sup>	

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
-----------	-------	----------------------	--------------------------------------

- <sup>1</sup> The reporting levels required in this table for priority pollutant constituents are established based on section 2.4.2 and Appendix 4 of the SIP.
- <sup>2</sup> The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent monitoring for chlorine disinfection byproducts (i.e., bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, and dichlorobromomethane) if chlorine is not used in the treatment process.
- <sup>3</sup> In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.
- <sup>4</sup> 24-hour flow proportional composite.
- <sup>5</sup> The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent monitoring for constituents that have already been sampled in a given semi-annual period, as required in Table E-3, except for hardness, pH, and temperature, which shall be conducted concurrently with the effluent sampling.
- <sup>6</sup> Unfiltered methyl mercury and total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2), and shall be analyzed by U.S. EPA method 1630/1631 (Revision E) with a reporting limit of 0.05 ng/L for methyl mercury and 0.5 ng/L for total mercury.

**X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements**

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.
2. Upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a summary monitoring report. The report shall contain both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year(s).
3. The Discharger shall report to the Central Valley Water Board any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission within 15 days of reporting the data to the Commission pursuant to section 313 of the "*Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act*" of 1986.

**B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMR's)**

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit SMR's using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>). The CIWQS Web site will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.
2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit monthly SMR's including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMR's are to include all new monitoring results obtained since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.
3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

**Table E-9. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule**

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Day	Permit effective date	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	Submit with monthly SMR
5/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
3/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
2/Month	Permit effective date	1 <sup>st</sup> day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
1/Month	Permit effective date	1 <sup>st</sup> day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
Quarterly	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 March 1 April through 30 June 1 July through 30 September 1 October through 31 December	1 May 1 August 1 November 1 February of following year
2/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 30 June 1 July through 31 December	1 August 1 February of following year
1/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 December	1 February of following year

4. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable Reporting Level (RL) and the current laboratory’s Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136.

The Discharger shall report the results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample using the following reporting protocols:

- a. Sample results greater than or equal to the RL shall be reported as measured by the laboratory (i.e., the measured chemical concentration in the sample).
- b. Sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory’s MDL, shall be reported as “Detected, but Not Quantified,” or DNQ. The estimated chemical concentration of the sample shall also be reported.

For the purposes of data collection, the laboratory shall write the estimated chemical concentration next to DNQ. The laboratory may, if such information is available, include numerical estimates of the data quality for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy (± a percentage of the reported

- value), numerical ranges (low to high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.
- c. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected," or ND.
  - d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the Minimum Level (ML) value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
5. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an AMEL, AWEL, or MDEL for priority pollutants and more than one sample result is available, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) or "Not Detected" (ND). In those cases, the Discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
- a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
  - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
6. The Discharger shall submit SMR's in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.
  - b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the WDR's; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.
  - c. The Discharger shall attach all laboratory analysis sheets, including quality assurance/quality control information, with all its SMR's for which sample analyses were performed.
7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMR's calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the average dry weather flow for the effluent. The average dry weather flow shall be calculated as specified in section VII.C and reported in the December SMR.

- b. **Mass Loading Limitations.** For BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, and ammonia, the Discharger shall calculate and report the mass loading (lbs/day) in the SMR's. The mass loading shall be calculated as follows:  

$$\text{Mass Loading (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34$$

When calculating daily mass loading, the daily average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For weekly average mass loading, the weekly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For monthly average mass loading, the monthly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used.
- c. **Removal Efficiency (BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS).** The Discharger shall calculate and report the percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS in the SMR's. The percent removal shall be calculated as specified in section VII.A. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- d. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the 7-day median of total coliform organisms for the effluent. The 7-day median of total coliform organisms shall be calculated as specified in section VII.D of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- e. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report monthly in the SMR: i) the dissolved oxygen concentration, ii) the percent of saturation in the main water mass, and iii) the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile dissolved oxygen concentration.
- f. **Monthly Average Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the monthly average turbidity increase in the receiving water applicable to the natural turbidity condition specified in section V.A.17 of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- g. **Monthly Average Temperature Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the monthly average temperature increase in the receiving water based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.
- h. **Annual Mass Loading Mercury Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the annual mercury mass loading for the effluent in the December SMR. The annual mass loading shall be calculated as specified in section VII.B of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

**C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's) – Not Applicable**

**D. Other Reports**

- 1. **Special Study Reports and Progress Reports.** As specified in the Special Provisions contained in section VI of the Order, special study and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the following reporting requirements.

**Table E-10. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports**

Special Provision	Reporting Requirements
Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan, Updated Plan (Special Provision VI.C.3.a)	<b>Within 9 months</b> of the effective date of this Order
Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan, Progress Reports (Special Provision VI.C.3.a)	<b>1 February</b> , annually

2. The Discharger shall report the results of any special studies, acute and chronic toxicity testing, TRE/TIE, PMP, and Pollution Prevention Plan required by Special Provisions – VI.C. The Discharger shall submit reports with the first monthly SMR scheduled to be submitted on or immediately following the report due date.
3. Within 60 days of permit adoption, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining reporting levels (RL's), method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval. The Discharger shall comply with the monitoring and reporting requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the SIP. The maximum required reporting levels for priority pollutant constituents shall be based on the Minimum Levels (ML's) contained in Appendix 4 of the SIP, determined in accordance with section 2.4.2 and section 2.4.3 of the SIP. In accordance with section 2.4.2 of the SIP, when there is more than one ML value for a given substance, the Central Valley Water Board shall include as RL's, in the permit, all ML values, and their associated analytical methods, listed in Appendix 4 that are below the calculated effluent limitation. The Discharger may select any one of those cited analytical methods for compliance determination. If no ML value is below the effluent limitation, then the Central Valley Water Board shall select as the RL, the lowest ML value, and its associated analytical method, listed in Appendix 4 for inclusion in the permit. Table E-8 (Attachment E) provides required maximum reporting levels in accordance with the SIP.
4. **Annual Operations Report.** By 1 February of each year, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing the following:
  - a. The names, certificate grades, and general responsibilities of all persons employed at the Facility.
  - b. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the plant for emergency and routine situations.
  - c. A statement certifying when the flow meter(s) and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration.
  - d. A statement certifying whether the current operation and maintenance manual, and contingency plan, reflect the wastewater treatment plant as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when these documents were last revised and last reviewed for adequacy.
  - e. The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the Central Valley Water Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing. The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the waste discharge requirements.

## ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

### Contents

I.	Permit Information.....	F-3
II.	Facility Description.....	F-4
	A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls.....	F-4
	B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters .....	F-4
	C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data .....	F-4
	D. Compliance Summary .....	F-6
	E. Planned Changes .....	F-7
III.	Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	F-7
	A. Legal Authorities.....	F-7
	B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).....	F-7
	C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans .....	F-7
	D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List.....	F-10
	E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations .....	F-10
IV.	Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-11
	A. Discharge Prohibitions.....	F-12
	B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations .....	F-12
	1. Scope and Authority .....	F-12
	2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations .....	F-13
	C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's) .....	F-14
	1. Scope and Authority .....	F-14
	2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives.....	F-14
	3. Determining the Need for WQBEL's.....	F-23
	4. WQBEL Calculations.....	F-36
	5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) .....	F-38
	D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations .....	F-41
	1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations .....	F-41
	2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations .....	F-41
	3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.....	F-41
	4. Antidegradation Policies.....	F-43
	5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.....	F-44
	E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable .....	F-45
	F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable .....	F-45
	G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-45
V.	Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations .....	F-45
	A. Surface Water.....	F-45
	B. Groundwater.....	F-48
VI.	Rationale for Provisions .....	F-48
	A. Standard Provisions.....	F-48
	B. Special Provisions .....	F-49
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	F-49
	2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-49
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention .....	F-53
	4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications.....	F-53
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW's Only) .....	F-54
	6. Other Special Provisions .....	F-55
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable .....	F-55

VII.	Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements .....	F-56
A.	Influent Monitoring .....	F-56
B.	Effluent Monitoring.....	F-56
C.	Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements .....	F-58
D.	Receiving Water Monitoring.....	F-58
	1. Surface Water .....	F-58
	2. Groundwater – Not Applicable .....	F-59
E.	Other Monitoring Requirements.....	F-59
VIII.	Public Participation .....	F-59
A.	Notification of Interested Parties.....	F-59
B.	Written Comments.....	F-60
C.	Public Hearing .....	F-60
D.	Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements .....	F-60
E.	Information and Copying.....	F-60
F.	Register of Interested Persons .....	F-60
G.	Additional Information .....	F-60

**Tables**

Table F-1.	Facility Information .....	F-3
Table F-2.	Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data.....	F-5
Table F-3.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses.....	F-8
Table F-4.	303 (d) List for Deer Creek.....	F-10
Table F-5.	Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations .....	F-13
Table F-6.	Lead Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L) .....	F-18
Table F-7.	Lead Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 62 mg/L) .....	F-19
Table F-8.	Copper Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L).....	F-19
Table F-9.	Chromium III Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L).....	F-20
Table F-10.	Cadmium (Chronic) Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L) .....	F-20
Table F-11.	Cadmium (Acute) Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 64 mg/L) .....	F-21
Table F-12.	Nickel Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L).....	F-21
Table F-13.	Silver (Acute) Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 56 mg/L).....	F-22
Table F-14.	Zinc Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L).....	F-22
Table F-15.	Summary of CTR Criteria for Hardness-dependent Metals.....	F-23
Table F-16.	Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives.....	F-26
Table F-17.	Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-38
Table F-18.	Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results.....	F-39
Table F-19.	Summary of Final Effluent Limitations .....	F-44

**ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET**

As described in section II.B of this Order, the Central Valley Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as findings of the Central Valley Water Board supporting the issuance of this Order. This Fact Sheet includes the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

This Order has been prepared under a standardized format to accommodate a broad range of discharge requirements for Dischargers in California. Only those sections or subsections of this Order that are specifically identified as “not applicable” have been determined not to apply to this Discharger. Sections or subsections of this Order not specifically identified as “not applicable” are fully applicable to this Discharger.

**I. PERMIT INFORMATION**

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the facility.

**Table F-1. Facility Information**

<b>WDID</b>	5A290104001
<b>CIWQS Facility Place ID</b>	236292
<b>Discharger</b>	Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant
<b>Facility Address</b>	12622 Pleasant Valley Road
	Penn Valley, CA 95946
	Nevada County
<b>Facility Contact, Title and Phone</b>	Britt Bolerjack, Wastewater Plant Operations Supervisor, (530) 265-7121
<b>Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports</b>	Steven Castleberry, Director of Public Works, (530) 265-1718
<b>Mailing Address</b>	950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, CA 95959
<b>Billing Address</b>	Same as Mailing Address
<b>Type of Facility</b>	Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)
<b>Major or Minor Facility</b>	Minor
<b>Threat to Water Quality</b>	2
<b>Complexity</b>	B
<b>Pretreatment Program</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Recycling Requirements</b>	Not Applicable
<b>Facility Permitted Flow</b>	0.69 million gallons per day (MGD), average dry weather flow
<b>Facility Design Flow</b>	0.69 MGD, average dry weather flow
<b>Watershed</b>	Upper Yuba
<b>Receiving Water</b>	Deer Creek
<b>Receiving Water Type</b>	Inland surface water

- A. Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1 (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a POTW.

For the purposes of this Order, references to the “discharger” or “permittee” in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

- B. The Facility discharges wastewater to Deer Creek, a water of the United States, tributary to the Yuba River within the Upper Yuba watershed. The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2009-0004 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0077828 adopted on 5 February 2009 and expired on 31 January 2014. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

Prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. The State Water Board retains the jurisdictional authority to enforce such requirements under Water Code section 1211.

- C. The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its waste discharge requirements (WDR's) and NPDES permit on 9 July 2013. The application was deemed complete on 19 March 2014. A site visit was conducted on 6 March 2014, to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge.

## II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the communities of Lake Wildwood and Penn Valley and serves a population of approximately 8,100. The design average dry weather flow capacity of the Facility is 0.69 MGD.

### A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

The treatment system at the Facility consists of a headworks with an auger-type fine screen, equalization basin, nitrification/denitrification basins, two oxidation ditches, two secondary clarifiers, four parallel dual media (anthracite coal and sand) filters, and ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection.

Scum and waste activated sludge (WAS) from the secondary clarifiers are pumped to the Walker Tank which has an aeration basin, secondary clarifier, and digestion area. Sludge from the digestion area is pumped to a centrifuge for dewatering. The dewatered sludge is taken off-site for disposal as alternative daily cover at a regional municipal solid waste landfill. The Facility includes sludge drying beds; however, the sludge drying beds have not been used for that purpose for several years.

### B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 20, T16N, R7E, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.
2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point 001 to Deer Creek below the Lake Wildwood spillway, a water of the United States and a tributary to the Yuba River at a point latitude 39° 14' 0" N and longitude 121° 13' 22" W.

### C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data

Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2009-0004 for discharges from Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2009-0004 are as follows:

**Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (April 2009 – December 2013)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	30	4.2	5.6	7.9
	lbs/day	93	140	280	13	21	32
	% Removal	85	--	--	98.4 <sup>1</sup>	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	4.9	8.7	21
	lbs/day	93	140	280	18.6	49	121
	% Removal	85	--	--	93.6 <sup>1</sup>	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	6.5 - 8.0	--	--	6.53 - 7.25
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	--	0.82	1.0	--	1.0
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	15	--	15
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	2.3	--	5.6	0.95	--	2.62
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	1	--	--	0.10	--	--
	lbs/day	9.3	--	--	0.38	--	--
Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	10	--	--	10	--	--
	lbs/day	93	--	--	27	--	--
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	--	--	70 <sup>2</sup> /90 <sup>3</sup>	--	--	95 <sup>1</sup>
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.01 <sup>4,5</sup>	0.02 <sup>4,6</sup>	--	--	0.005
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	2.2 <sup>7</sup>	23	--	--	1,600
Average Dry Weather Flow	MGD	--	--	1.12 <sup>8</sup>	--	--	1.16 <sup>9</sup>
Mercury, Total Recoverable	lbs/month	0.0021 <sup>10</sup>	--	--	0.00031 <sup>11</sup>	--	--
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	700 <sup>12</sup>	--	--	547 <sup>13</sup>	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (April 2009 – December 2013)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge

- 1 Represents the minimum observed value.
- 2 Minimum for any one bioassay.
- 3 Median for any three consecutive bioassays.
- 4 Applicable until submittal of written certification that a chlorine-based disinfection system is no longer in use and chlorine-containing chemicals are not added to the treatment process for wastewater discharged to the receiving water.
- 5 Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.
- 6 Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.
- 7 Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.
- 8 The average dry weather flow shall not exceed 1.12 MGD.
- 9 Represents the maximum observed average daily flow.
- 10 The monthly average total recoverable mercury loading in the effluent shall not exceed 0.0021 lbs/month.
- 11 Represents the maximum observed total monthly mass discharge.
- 12 Applied as an annual average effluent limitation.
- 13 Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration.

**D. Compliance Summary**

1. The Central Valley Water Board issued Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Complaint No. R5-2013-0555 on 10 September 2013 which proposed to assess a civil liability of \$9,000 against the Discharger for effluent violations of total coliform organisms that occurred during the period of 1 December 2010 and 30 June 2013. The Discharger paid the mandatory minimum penalty of \$3,000.
2. A compliance inspection of the Facility was conducted on 3 August 2009. Major findings from the inspection include the following:
  - a. Excessive algae was observed in the clarifiers and filter backwash and vegetation and debris were observed in the chlorine contact chamber, indicating that the cleaning frequency was inadequate.
3. A compliance inspection of the Facility was conducted on 1 December 2010. Major findings from the inspection include the following:
  - a. Time Schedule Order R5-2009-0005 required the Discharger to submit a workplan/schedule for construction of a UV disinfection system within 6 months (i.e., 5 August 2009) following adoption of the TSO and to submit quarterly progress reports for the project. The Facility representative was unsure if a workplan/schedule or quarterly progress reports had been submitted.
  - b. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) for Order R5-2009-0004 requires the Discharger to calibrate all flow measurement devices annually. The Facility influent and effluent flow measurement devices had been last calibrated on 29 July 2009 and 28 July 2009, respectively.
4. A compliance inspection of the Facility was conducted on 22 January 2013. No major findings were noted during the inspection.

### E. Planned Changes

The Discharger is planning a regionalization project to accept approximately 0.06 MGD untreated septic tank effluent diverted from the Penn Valley Wastewater Treatment Plant during the term of this Order. The project includes installation of a sewage force main and lift station from the Penn Valley collection system to the Facility. The regionalization project would result in the abandonment of the Penn Valley Wastewater Treatment Plant, the Valley Oak Court Wastewater Treatment Plant, and another independently operated pond percolation treatment plant. The current design capacity of the Facility of 0.69 MGD is sufficient to accommodate the additional flows.

The Discharger is also planning the following upgrades, subject to funding:

1. Upgrading or replacing the existing headworks to add better screening capabilities, grit removal, and odor control for the influent sewer;
2. New septage and vector waste receiving facilities;
3. Improvements to mitigate odors from the plant and the collection system adjacent to the plant; and
4. Due to concerns regarding chronic toxicity that may be associated with the UV disinfection system, the Discharger may construct upgrades to add peracetic acid (PAA) upstream of the UV disinfection to enhance disinfection at the Facility. This Order includes effluent monitoring for PAA when PAA is used in the treatment system.

### III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the requirements and authorities described in this section.

#### A. Legal Authorities

This Order serves as WDR's pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters.

#### B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of CEQA, (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code.

#### C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans

1. **Water Quality Control Plans.** Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans.
  - a. **Basin Plan.** The Central Valley Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition* (Revised October 2011), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan.

The Basin Plan at II-2.00 states that the beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. The Basin Plan in Table II-1, Section II, does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Deer Creek, but does

identify present and potential uses for the Yuba River from Englebright Dam to the Feather River, to which Deer Creek is tributary. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Thus, beneficial uses applicable to Deer Creek are as follows:

**Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses**

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Deer Creek	<u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including stock watering (AGR); hydropower generation (POW); water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); warm and cold migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR); warm and cold spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN); and wildlife habitat (WILD).

2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000, U.S. EPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on 13 February 2001. These rules contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants.
3. **State Implementation Policy.** On 2 March 2000, the State Water 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 became effective on 28 April 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the U.S. EPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Central Valley Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on 18 May 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. EPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on 24 February 2005, that became effective on 13 July 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.
4. **Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulation 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California’s antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution 68-16 (“Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California”). Resolution 68-16 is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Central Valley Water Board’s Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge must be consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.
5. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These

anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.

6. **Domestic Water Quality.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels (MCL's) designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.
7. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.
8. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act.** Section 13263.6(a) of the Water Code, requires that *"the Regional Water Board shall prescribe effluent limitations as part of the waste discharge requirements of a POTW for all substances that the most recent toxic chemical release data reported to the state emergency response commission pursuant to Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 11023) (EPCRA) indicate as discharged into the POTW, for which the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board has established numeric water quality objectives, and has determined that the discharge is or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to, an excursion above any numeric water quality objective"*.

The most recent toxic chemical data report does not indicate any reportable off-site releases or discharges to the collection system for this Facility. Therefore, a reasonable potential analysis based on information from EPCRA cannot be conducted. Based on information from EPCRA, there is no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above any numeric water quality objectives included within the Basin Plan or in any State Water Board plan, so no effluent limitations are included in this permit pursuant to Water Code section 13263.6(a).

However, as detailed elsewhere in this Order, available effluent data indicate that there are constituents present in the effluent that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality standards and require inclusion of effluent limitations based on federal and state laws and regulations.

9. **Storm Water Requirements.** U.S. EPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 C.F.R. parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The Discharger has submitted a Notice of Intent (NOI) and been approved for coverage under the State Water Board Water Quality Order 97-03-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities Excluding Construction Activities. However, the State Water Board does not require wastewater treatment facilities with design flows less than 1 MGD to obtain coverage under the Industrial Storm Water General Order. As discussed in section IV.B

of this Fact Sheet, this Order revises the permitted flow from 1.12 MGD to 0.69 MGD, consistent with the design capacity of the Facility. In anticipation of the flow reduction, the Discharger submitted to the State Water Board a Notice of Termination to terminate their coverage under the Industrial Storm Water General Order. The Discharger received approval of the Notice of Termination on 19 September 2014. This Order does not regulate storm water.

**D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List**

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 CWA, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. The waters on these lists do not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 11 October 2011 U.S. EPA gave final approval to California's 2008-2010 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. The Basin Plan references this list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), which are defined as "...those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 C.F.R. part 130, et seq.)." The Basin Plan also states, "Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment." The listing for Deer Creek (Yuba County) includes pH.
2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL's).** U.S. EPA requires the Central Valley Water Board to develop TMDL's for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. Table F-4, below, identifies the 303(d) listings and the status of each TMDL.

**Table F-4. 303 (d) List for Deer Creek**

Pollutant	Potential Sources	TMDL Completion <sup>1</sup>
pH	Internal Nutrient Cycling (primarily lakes)	(2019)

<sup>1</sup> Dates in parenthesis are proposed TMDL completion dates.

3. The 303(d) listings and TMDL's have been considered in the development of the Order. This Order contains effluent limits based on the Basin Plan water quality objectives for pH. If a TMDL program for pH is adopted, this Order shall be reopened to modify the effluent limitation based on the Waste Load Allocation.

**E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations**

1. **Title 27.** The discharge authorized herein and the treatment and storage facilities associated with the discharge of treated municipal wastewater, except for discharges of residual sludge and solid waste, are exempt from the requirements of Title 27, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 20005 *et seq* (hereafter Title 27). The exemption, pursuant to Title 27 CCR section 20090(a), is based on the following:
  - a. The waste consists primarily of domestic sewage and treated effluent;
  - b. The waste discharge requirements are consistent with water quality objectives; and
  - c. The treatment and storage facilities described herein are associated with a municipal wastewater treatment plant.

#### IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

Effluent limitations and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to sections 301 (Effluent Limitations), 302 (Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations), 304 (Information and Guidelines), and 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards) of the CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The CWA mandates the implementation of effluent limitations that are as stringent as necessary to meet water quality standards established pursuant to state or federal law [33 U.S.C., §1311(b)(1)(C); 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)]. NPDES permits must incorporate discharge limits necessary to ensure that water quality standards are met. This requirement applies to narrative criteria as well as to criteria specifying maximum amounts of particular pollutants. Pursuant to federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that *“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.”* Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vi), further provide that *“[w]here a state has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in an effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits.”*

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include WQBEL's to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where numeric water quality objectives have not been established. The Basin Plan at page IV-17.00, contains an implementation policy, “Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives”, that specifies that the Central Valley Water Board *“will, on a case-by-case basis, adopt numerical limitations in orders which will implement the narrative objectives.”* This Policy complies with 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1). With respect to narrative objectives, the Central Valley Water Board must establish effluent limitations using one or more of three specified sources, including: (1) U.S. EPA's published water quality criteria, (2) a proposed state criterion (i.e., water quality objective) or an explicit state policy interpreting its narrative water quality criteria (i.e., the Central Valley Water Board's “Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives”)(40 C.F.R. sections 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(A), (B) or (C)), or (3) an indicator parameter.

The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, discoloration, radionuclides, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: *“All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.”* (Basin Plan at III-8.00) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At a minimum, *“...water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)”* in Title 22 of CCR. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Central Valley Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCL's. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: *“Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or*

*municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.”*

#### **A. Discharge Prohibitions**

1. **Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.
2. **Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of wastes, except under the conditions at 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4)).** As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), define “bypass” as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Water Board’s prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Board adopted a precedential decision, Order WQO 2002-0015, which cites the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.  
  
Order R5-2009-0004 included a separate prohibition prohibiting bypasses of the UV disinfection system, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provision I.G. This prohibition is duplicative of Prohibition III.B in this Order and thus has not been retained.
3. **Prohibition III.C (No controllable condition shall create a nuisance).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13050 that requires water quality objectives established for the prevention of nuisance within a specific area. The Basin Plan prohibits conditions that create a nuisance.
4. **Prohibition III.D (No inclusion of pollutant-free wastewater shall cause improper operation of the Facility’s systems).** This prohibition is based on 40 C.F.R. section 122.41 et seq. that requires the proper design and operation of treatment facilities.

#### **B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations**

##### **1. Scope and Authority**

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing U.S. EPA permit regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at 40 C.F.R. part 133.

Regulations promulgated in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3(a)(1) require technology-based effluent limitations for municipal Dischargers to be placed in NPDES permits based on Secondary Treatment Standards or Equivalent to Secondary Treatment Standards.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) established the minimum performance requirements for POTW’s [defined in section 304(d)(1)]. Section 301(b)(1)(B) of that Act requires that such treatment works must, as a minimum, meet effluent limitations based on secondary treatment as defined by the U.S. EPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, U.S. EPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 C.F.R. part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

**2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations**

- a. **BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS.** Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. This Order requires WQBEL's that are equal to or more stringent than the secondary technology-based treatment described in 40 C.F.R. part 133 and are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. (See section IV.C.3.b of this Attachment for the discussion on pathogens.) In addition, 40 C.F.R. section 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS over each calendar month. This Order requires Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's) that are equal to or more stringent than the secondary technology-based treatment described in 40 C.F.R. Part 133 (See section IV.C.3.b of the Fact Sheet for a discussion on Pathogens which includes WQBEL's for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS).
- b. **Flow.** Order R5-2009-0004 included an average dry weather flow effluent limitation of 1.12 MGD. Per a 2012 Lake Wildwood Process and Hydraulic Modeling memorandum from the Discharger's consultant (Kennedy/Jenks Consultants), the actual design average dry weather flow capacity of the Facility is 0.69 MGD. Thus, the Discharger has requested a reduction in the permitted flow to be consistent with the actual design flow. Therefore, this Order contains an average dry weather discharge flow effluent limitation of 0.69 MGD.
- c. **pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 C.F.R. Part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units. However, this Order requires more stringent WQBELs for pH to comply with the Basin Plan's water quality objectives for pH.

**Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations  
 Discharge Point 001**

**Table F-5. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Flow	MGD	0.69 <sup>1</sup>	--	--	--	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-Day @ 20°C) <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	172	259	--	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--
pH <sup>2</sup>	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Total Suspended Solids <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	172	259	--	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum

- <sup>1</sup> The average dry weather flow shall not exceed 0.69 MGD.
- <sup>2</sup> More stringent WQBEL's are applicable to the discharge and are included in this Order, as described further in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet.
- <sup>3</sup> Based upon an average dry weather flow of 0.69 MGD.

**C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's)**

**1. Scope and Authority**

CWA Section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements or other provisions, is discussed in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet.

40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBEL's must be established using: (1) U.S. EPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting the state's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBEL's when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of 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 any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

**2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives**

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply.

The Basin Plan on page II-1.00 states: *"Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning..."* and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that *"...disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses."*

The federal CWA section 101(a)(2), states: *"it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be*

*achieved by July 1, 1983.*” Federal Regulations, developed to implement the requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal Regulations, 40 C.F.R. sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the State regulated to protect the beneficial uses of public water supply, protection and propagation of fish, shell fish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation. 40 C.F.R. section 131.3(e) defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after 28 November 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 C.F.R. section 131.10 requires that uses be obtained by implementing effluent limitations, requires that all downstream uses be protected and states that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a beneficial use for any waters of the United States.

- a. **Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.** The Facility discharges to Deer Creek, a tributary to Yuba River, Englebright Dam to Feather River Hydrologic Area (515.3) within the Sacramento Hydrologic Basin. Deer Creek is an ephemeral stream that is effluent dominant. However, about a mile upstream of the Facility’s outfall, Deer Creek is fed intermittently by releases from Lake Wildwood Dam. Between approximately May and October of each year, water is typically released to Deer Creek from the bottom of Lake Wildwood, and between October and May, releases are typically from the Dam’s spillway. Refer to III.C.1. above for a complete description of the receiving water beneficial uses.
- b. **Effluent and Ambient Background Data.** The reasonable potential analysis (RPA), as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data from April 2009 through December 2013, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMR’s and the ROWD.

SIP section 1.2 states that the Central Valley Water Board has the discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in implementing the SIP. The Discharger converted from chlorine disinfection to UV disinfection on 30 December 2012. Therefore, effluent data collected prior to 30 December 2012 is not representative of the Facility’s typical functional capabilities and was not considered in the RPA for evaluating chlorine disinfection byproducts (i.e., bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, and dichlorobromomethane) and salinity.

Order R5-2009-0004 did not require analysis of priority pollutants in the receiving water, and therefore, receiving water data for priority pollutants was not used in the RPA. Section 1.3 of the SIP states, *“The RWQCB shall require periodic monitoring (at least once prior to the issuance and reissuance of a permit) for pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitation have been established; however, the RWQCB may choose to exempt low volume discharges, determined to have no significant adverse impact on water quality, from this monitoring requirement.”* The discharge is a minor discharge and is treated to a tertiary level, and thus is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on water quality. Therefore, consistent with Order R5-2009-0004 and section 1.3 of the SIP, this Order does not require the Discharger to collect upstream receiving water samples for analysis of priority pollutants.

- c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.** Based on the available information, the worst-case dilution is assumed to be zero to provide protection for the receiving water beneficial uses. The impact of assuming zero dilution/assimilative capacity

within the receiving water is that the discharge limitations are end-of-pipe limits with no allowance for dilution within the receiving water.

- d. **Conversion Factors.** The CTR contains aquatic life criteria for arsenic, cadmium, chromium III, chromium VI, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc which are presented in dissolved concentrations. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The default U.S. EPA conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 of the SIP were used to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria.
- e. **Hardness-Dependent CTR Metals Criteria.** The *California Toxics Rule* and the *National Toxics Rule* contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.

This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness as required by the SIP<sup>1</sup> and the CTR<sup>2</sup>. The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. (SIP, § 1.2; 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4)) The CTR requires that the hardness values used shall be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones.<sup>3</sup> Where design flows for aquatic life criteria include the lowest one-day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (1Q10) and the lowest average seven consecutive day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (7Q10).<sup>4</sup> The CTR also requires that when mixing zones are allowed, the CTR criteria apply at the edge of the mixing zone, otherwise the criteria apply throughout the water body including at the point of discharge.<sup>5</sup> The CTR does not define whether the term “ambient,” as applied in the regulations, necessarily requires the consideration of upstream as opposed to downstream hardness conditions.

The State Water Board provided direction regarding the selection of hardness in two precedential water quality orders; WQO 2008-0008 for the City of Davis Wastewater Treatment Plant and WQO 2004-0013 for the Yuba City Wastewater Treatment Plant. The State Water Board recognized that the SIP and the CTR do not discuss the manner in which hardness is to be ascertained, and, thus, Regional Water Boards have considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness. (Davis Order, p.10) The State Water Board explained that it is necessary that, “*The [hardness] value selected should provide protection for all times of discharge under varying hardness conditions.*” (Yuba City Order, p. 8). The Davis Order also provides that, “*Regardless of the hardness used, the resulting limits must always be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions.*” (Davis Order, p. 11)

---

<sup>1</sup> The SIP does not address how to determine the hardness for application to the equations for the protection of aquatic life when using hardness-dependent metals criteria. It simply states, in Section 1.2, that the criteria shall be properly adjusted for hardness using the hardness of the receiving water.

<sup>2</sup> The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used.

<sup>3</sup> 40 CFR 131.38 (c)(4)(ii)

<sup>4</sup> 40 CFR 131.38 (c)(4)(iii) Table 4

<sup>5</sup> 40 CFR 131.38 (c)(2)(i)

The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR<sup>1</sup>, is as follows:

$$\text{CTR Criterion} = \text{WER} \times (e^{m[\ln(H)]+b}) \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

Where:

H = hardness (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)<sup>2</sup>

WER = water-effect ratio

m, b = metal- and criterion-specific constants

Upstream receiving water hardness varied from 27 mg/L to 56 mg/L, based on four samples collected between 1 March 2012 and 7 November 2012. Downstream receiving water data was not collected during the previous permit term. During portions of the year, Deer Creek is effluent dominated, so the downstream ambient hardness that is consistent with the design low flow conditions is equivalent to the effluent hardness because the effluent is, in effect, the ambient surface water under these regularly occurring conditions. The effluent hardness varied from 67 mg/L to 182 mg/L, based on 57 samples collected between 2 April 2009 and 11 December 2013.

For calculating the CTR criteria the downstream ambient hardness has been used. The SIP, CTR, and State Water Board do not require use of the minimum observed ambient hardness in the CTR equations. The hardness used must be consistent with design conditions and protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions. The minimum effluent hardness of 67 mg/L represents the downstream ambient hardness under the design condition and was considered for use in the CTR equations.

A downstream ambient hardness of 67 mg/L results in CTR criteria that are protective of aquatic life under all flow conditions for copper, zinc, chromium III, nickel, and cadmium (chronic). However, for lead, silver, and cadmium (acute), using this hardness to calculate the CTR criteria is protective during the effluent dominated condition, but lower criteria are necessary to be fully protective of aquatic life under higher flow conditions in the receiving water.

The Facility discharges both hardness and metals, which must be considered in the downstream ambient receiving water to ensure the criteria are protective under all flow conditions. The tables below examine how the downstream ambient conditions change with varying mixtures of effluent and upstream receiving water. The calculations determine whether or not toxicity could result from one or more metals using the selected design ambient hardness to calculate the CTR criteria.

A simple mass balance (Equation 2) is used to model the ambient concentrations of hardness and metals in the receiving water downstream of the discharge for all possible mixtures of effluent and upstream receiving water under all flow conditions.

$$C_{\text{downstream}} = C_{\text{upstream}} \times (1-\text{MIX}) + C_{\text{effluent}} \times (\text{MIX}) \quad (\text{Equation 2})^3$$

Where:

C<sub>downstream</sub> = Downstream receiving water concentration

<sup>1</sup> 40 CFR 131.38(b)(2).

<sup>2</sup> For this discussion, all hardness values are in mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. EPA NPDES Permit Writers' Manual, September 2010 (EPA-833-K-10-001)

$C_{\text{upstream}}$  = Upstream receiving water concentration

$C_{\text{effluent}}$  = Effluent concentration

MIX = Fraction of effluent in downstream ambient receiving water

For each of several downstream ambient mixtures of upstream receiving water and effluent, the potential for toxicity is examined. The hardness of the mixture is calculated, and the resultant water quality criterion is calculated from the CTR equation. The metals concentration is also calculated for the mixture of upstream receiving water and effluent. If the metals concentration complies with the CTR criterion for that mixture, the ambient mixture is not toxic and “Yes” is indicated in the far right column. If the metals concentration exceeds the CTR criterion for that mixture, the ambient concentration is toxic and “No” is indicated in the far right column. The results of these evaluations are summarized in Table F-14.

For this evaluation, the following conservative assumptions have been made:

- Upstream receiving water at the lowest observed upstream receiving water hardness (i.e., 27 mg/L)
- No assimilative capacity for each metal in the upstream receiving water (i.e., metals concentration equal to CTR criterion calculated using a hardness of 27 mg/L)
- Effluent hardness at the lowest observed effluent hardness of 67 mg/L

Table F-6, below, is an example for lead where a design ambient hardness of 67 mg/L (i.e., downstream receiving water hardness at design low flow conditions) was used to calculate the CTR criteria. In this example, the mixed downstream ambient lead concentrations exceed the mixed CTR criteria at some mixtures. This example demonstrates that using a design ambient hardness of 67 mg/L to calculate the CTR criteria for lead is not fully protective under the reasonable worst-case conditions described above. The CTR criteria for silver and cadmium (acute) act in the same manner as lead. Tables similar to Table F-6 are not provided in this discussion for these metals, but the results are similarly non-compliant with the CTR criteria. Based on the conservative assumptions discussed above, an iterative method was used to determine the applicable design ambient hardness that results in fully protective criteria for lead, silver, and cadmium (acute).

**Table F-6. Lead Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L)**

		Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Lead Concentration		0.60 µg/L <sup>1</sup>	
		Lead Chronic Criterion <sup>2</sup>		1.9 µg/L	
		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
Mix <sup>6</sup>		Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Lead <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria?
High Flow  Low Flow	1%	27	0.61	0.61	Yes
	5%	29	0.66	0.67	No
	15%	33	0.78	0.80	No
	25%	37	0.90	0.93	No
	50%	47	1.22	1.26	No
	75%	57	1.56	1.58	No
	100%	67	1.91	1.91	Yes

The following tables (F-7 through F-14) demonstrate that the selected design ambient hardness used to calculate the CTR criteria result in protective criteria for all flow conditions (i.e., the mixed downstream ambient metals concentrations do not exceed the CTR criteria). Table F-15 summarizes the design ambient hardness for each metal.

**Table F-7. Lead Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 62 mg/L)**

Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Lead Concentration		0.60 µg/L <sup>1</sup>			
Lead Chronic Criterion <sup>2</sup>		1.7 µg/L			
Mix <sup>6</sup>		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
		Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Lead <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria?
High Flow ↓	1%	27	0.61	0.61	Yes
	5%	29	0.66	0.66	Yes
	15%	33	0.78	0.77	Yes
	25%	37	0.90	0.88	Yes
	50%	47	1.22	1.17	Yes
Low Flow	75%	57	1.56	1.45	Yes
	100%	67	1.91	1.73	Yes

**Table F-8. Copper Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L)**

Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Copper Concentration		3.0 µg/L <sup>1</sup>			
Copper Chronic Criterion <sup>2</sup>		6.6 µg/L			
Mix <sup>6</sup>		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
		Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Copper <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria?
High Flow ↓	1%	27	3.1	3.1	Yes
	5%	29	3.2	3.2	Yes
	15%	33	3.6	3.6	Yes
	25%	37	4.0	3.9	Yes
	50%	47	4.9	4.8	Yes
Low Flow	75%	57	5.8	5.7	Yes
	100%	67	6.6	6.6	Yes

**Table F-9. Chromium III Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L)**

<b>Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Chromium III Concentration</b>		<b>71 µg/L<sup>1</sup></b>			
		<b>Chromium III Chronic Criterion<sup>2</sup></b>			<b>149 µg/L</b>
		<b>Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration</b>			
<b>Mix<sup>6</sup></b>		<b>Hardness<sup>3</sup> (mg/L)</b>	<b>CTR Criteria<sup>4</sup> (µg/L)</b>	<b>Chromium III<sup>5</sup> (µg/L)</b>	<b>Complies with CTR Criteria?</b>
High Flow ↓	1%	27	72	72	<b>Yes</b>
	5%	29	75	75	<b>Yes</b>
	15%	33	84	83	<b>Yes</b>
	25%	37	92	91	<b>Yes</b>
	50%	47	112	110	<b>Yes</b>
Low Flow	75%	57	131	130	<b>Yes</b>
	100%	67	149	149	<b>Yes</b>

**Table F-10. Cadmium (Chronic) Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L)**

<b>Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Cadmium Concentration</b>		<b>0.88 µg/L<sup>1</sup></b>			
		<b>Cadmium Chronic Criterion<sup>2</sup></b>			<b>1.8 µg/L</b>
		<b>Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration</b>			
<b>Mix<sup>6</sup></b>		<b>Hardness<sup>3</sup> (mg/L)</b>	<b>CTR Criteria<sup>4</sup> (µg/L)</b>	<b>Cadmium<sup>5</sup> (µg/L)</b>	<b>Complies with CTR Criteria?</b>
High Flow ↓	1%	27	0.9	0.9	<b>Yes</b>
	5%	29	0.9	0.9	<b>Yes</b>
	15%	33	1.0	1.0	<b>Yes</b>
	25%	37	1.1	1.1	<b>Yes</b>
	50%	47	1.4	1.3	<b>Yes</b>
Low Flow	75%	57	1.6	1.6	<b>Yes</b>
	100%	67	1.8	1.8	<b>Yes</b>

**Table F-11. Cadmium (Acute) Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 64 mg/L)**

Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Cadmium Concentration		1.0 µg/L <sup>1</sup>			
Cadmium Chronic Criterion <sup>2</sup>		2.7 µg/L			
Mix <sup>6</sup>		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
		Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Cadmium <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria?
High Flow ↓	1%	27	1.0	1.0	Yes
	5%	29	1.1	1.1	Yes
	15%	33	1.3	1.3	Yes
	25%	37	1.5	1.5	Yes
	50%	47	1.9	1.9	Yes
Low Flow	75%	57	2.4	2.3	Yes
	100%	67	2.9	2.7	Yes

**Table F-12. Nickel Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L)**

Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Nickel Concentration		17 µg/L <sup>1</sup>			
Nickel Chronic Criterion <sup>2</sup>		37 µg/L			
Mix <sup>6</sup>		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
		Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Nickel <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria?
High Flow ↓	1%	27	17	17	Yes
	5%	29	18	18	Yes
	15%	33	20	20	Yes
	25%	37	23	22	Yes
	50%	47	28	27	Yes
Low Flow	75%	57	32	32	Yes
	100%	67	37	37	Yes

**Table F-13. Silver (Acute) Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 56 mg/L)**

Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Silver Concentration		0.43 µg/L <sup>1</sup>			
Silver Chronic Criterion <sup>2</sup>		1.5 µg/L			
Mix <sup>6</sup>	Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration				
	Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Silver <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria?	
High Flow ↓	1%	27	0.4	0.4	Yes
	5%	29	0.5	0.5	Yes
	15%	33	0.6	0.6	Yes
	25%	37	0.7	0.7	Yes
	50%	47	1.1	1.0	Yes
Low Flow	75%	57	1.5	1.2	Yes
	100%	67	2.0	1.5	Yes

**Table F-14. Zinc Evaluation (Design Ambient Hardness = 67 mg/L)**

Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Zinc Concentration		40 µg/L <sup>1</sup>			
Zinc Chronic Criterion <sup>2</sup>		85 µg/L			
Mix <sup>6</sup>	Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration				
	Hardness <sup>3</sup> (mg/L)	CTR Criteria <sup>4</sup> (µg/L)	Zinc <sup>5</sup> (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria?	
High Flow ↓	1%	27	40	40	Yes
	5%	29	42	42	Yes
	15%	33	47	46	Yes
	25%	37	52	51	Yes
	50%	47	63	62	Yes
Low Flow	75%	57	74	74	Yes
	100%	67	85	85	Yes

Footnotes for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals Tables (F-6 through F-14):

- <sup>1</sup> Highest assumed upstream receiving water metals concentration calculated using CTR equation (Equation 1) for chronic/acute criterion at a hardness of 67 mg/L.
- <sup>2</sup> CTR criteria calculated using CTR equation (Equation 1) for chronic/acute criterion at the design ambient hardness for the particular metal (see Table F-6).
- <sup>3</sup> Mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable mixture using Equation 2.
- <sup>4</sup> Mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic/acute criteria calculated using the CTR equation (Equation 1) at the mixed hardness.
- <sup>5</sup> Mixed downstream ambient metals concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent metals concentrations at the applicable mixture using Equation 2.
- <sup>6</sup> The mixture percentage represents the fraction of effluent in the downstream ambient receiving water. The mixture ranges from 1% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

The applicable design ambient hardness and CTR criteria for the hardness-dependent metals for which toxicity in ambient waters does not occur are as follows in Table F-15.

**Table F-15. Summary of CTR Criteria for Hardness-dependent Metals**

CTR Metals	Design Ambient Hardness (mg/L)	CTR Criteria (µg/L, total recoverable) <sup>1</sup>	
		acute	chronic
Copper	67	9.6	6.6
Chromium (III)	67	1251	149
Cadmium	64 (acute) 67 (chronic)	2.7	1.8
Lead	62	44	1.7
Nickel	67	334	37
Silver	56	1.5	--
Zinc	67	85	85

<sup>1</sup> Metals criteria rounded to two significant figures in accordance with the CTR.

### 3. Determining the Need for WQBEL's

- a. **Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** WQBEL's are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential (i.e., constituents were not detected in the effluent or receiving water); however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

Most constituents with no reasonable potential are not discussed in this Order. However, the following constituents were found to have no reasonable potential after assessment of the data:

#### i. Carbon Tetrachloride

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.25 µg/L for carbon tetrachloride for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for carbon tetrachloride was 1.4 µg/L based on 21 samples collected between April 2009 and April 2014. However, carbon tetrachloride has not been detected in the effluent in six samples collected since conversion to UV disinfection (December 2012). Although carbon tetrachloride is not typically considered a chlorine disinfection byproduct, it is possible for carbon tetrachloride to be formed during chlorine disinfection under some circumstances.

SIP section 1.2 requires that the Regional Board use all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information, as determined by the Regional Board, to implement the SIP. SIP section 1.2 further states that the Regional Board has the discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in implementing the SIP. Therefore, in accordance with section 1.2 of the SIP, the Central Valley Water Board has determined that data reported prior to the conversion to UV disinfection is inappropriate to be used to determine reasonable potential. Based on monitoring data collected subsequent to the conversion to UV disinfection, carbon tetrachloride in the discharge does not demonstrate

reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR human health criterion, and WQBEL's for carbon tetrachloride have not been included in this Order. Monitoring has been established for carbon tetrachloride in the effluent twice during the third year of the permit term. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding appropriate effluent limitations.

ii. **Chlorine Residual**

- (a) **WQO.** U.S. EPA developed National Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Order R5-2009-0004 included effluent limitations for chlorine residual based on the NAWQC criteria.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The Discharger converted from chlorine disinfection to UV disinfection on 30 December 2012. The Discharger converted the chlorine contact basin into a plant water storage basin, in which the Discharger uses low levels of chlorine for algae control. Chlorine has not been detected in the effluent since August 2010. Therefore, the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective and the effluent limitations for chlorine residual have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

iii. **Chlorodibromomethane**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes criteria of 0.41 µg/L for chlorodibromomethane for the protection of human health for waters where both water and organisms are consumed. Order R5-2009-0004 included effluent limitations for chlorodibromomethane based on the CTR criterion.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Chlorodibromomethane was not detected in the effluent based on 12 samples collected between January 2013 and December 2013. Upstream receiving water data for chlorodibromomethane is not available. Therefore, chlorodibromomethane in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR human health criterion, and the WQBEL's for chlorodibromomethane have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

iv. **Dichlorobromomethane**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes criteria of 0.56 µg/L for dichlorobromomethane for the protection of human health for waters where both water and organisms are consumed. Order R5-2009-0004 included effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane based on the CTR criterion.

(b) **RPA Results.** Dichlorobromomethane was not detected in the effluent based on 12 samples collected between January 2013 and December 2013. Upstream receiving water data for dichlorobromomethane is not available. Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR human health criterion, and the WQBEL's for dichlorobromomethane have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

v. **Nitrite**

(a) **WQO.** The California Department of Drinking Water (DDW) has adopted a Primary MCL for the protection of human health for nitrite of 1 mg/L (measured as nitrogen). U.S. EPA has developed a Primary MCL and an MCL goal of 1 mg/L for nitrite (as nitrogen). Order R5-2009-0004 included an effluent limitation for nitrite based on the Primary MCL.

(b) **RPA Results.** The maximum effluent nitrite concentration was 0.25 mg/L based on 247 samples collected between April 2009 and December 2013. Upstream receiving water data for nitrite is not available. Therefore, nitrite in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCL, and the effluent limitation for nitrite has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet). As discussed in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet, this Order does retain an effluent limitation for nitrate plus nitrite to ensure that the treatment process adequately nitrifies and denitrifies the waste stream.

vi. **Salinity**

(a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCL's, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for certain specified water bodies for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. The U.S. EPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no U.S. EPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate. Additionally, there are no U.S. EPA numeric water quality criteria for the protection of agricultural, livestock, and industrial uses. Numeric values for the protection of these uses are typically based on site specific conditions and evaluations to determine the appropriate constituent threshold necessary to interpret the narrative chemical constituent Basin Plan objective. The Central Valley Water Board must determine the applicable numeric limit to implement the narrative objective for the protection of agricultural supply. The Central Valley Water Board is currently implementing the CV-SALTS initiative to develop a Basin Plan Amendment that will establish a salt and nitrate Management Plan for the Central Valley. Through this effort the Basin Plan will be amended to define how the narrative water quality objective is to be interpreted for the protection of agricultural use. All studies conducted through this Order to establish an agricultural limit to

implement the narrative objective will be reviewed by and consistent with the efforts currently underway by CV-SALTS.

**Table F-16. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives**

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Objective <sup>1</sup>	Secondary MCL <sup>2</sup>	U.S. EPA NAWQC	Effluent <sup>3</sup>	
				Average <sup>4</sup>	Maximum
EC (µmhos/cm)	Varies	900, 1600, 2200	N/A	407	472
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	N/A	249	259
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	860 1-hr 230 4-day	33	33

<sup>1</sup> Narrative chemical constituent objective of the Basin Plan. Procedures for establishing the applicable numeric limitation to implement the narrative objective can be found in the Policy for Application of Water Quality, Chapter IV, Section 8 of the Basin Plan. However, the Basin Plan does not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. In cases where the natural background concentration of a particular constituent exceeds an applicable water quality objective, the natural background concentration will be considered to comply with the objective.

<sup>2</sup> The Secondary MCL's are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.

<sup>3</sup> Based on monitoring data collected after conversion to UV disinfection (i.e., January 2013 to December 2013).

<sup>4</sup> Maximum calendar annual average.

- (1) **Chloride.** The Secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** The Secondary MCL for electrical conductivity is 900 µmhos/cm as a recommended level, 1600 µmhos/cm as an upper level, and 2200 µmhos/cm as a short-term maximum.
- (3) **Sulfate.** The Secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** The Secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

(b) **RPA Results**

- (1) **Chloride.** The effluent chloride concentration was 33 mg/L based on one sample collected between January 2013 and December 2013. This level does not exceed the Secondary MCL. Upstream receiving water data for chloride is not available.
- (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows a maximum annual average effluent electrical conductivity concentration of 407 µmhos/cm, with a range from 356 µmhos/cm to 472 µmhos/cm based on 53 samples collected between January 2013 and December 2013. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The maximum observed annual

average background receiving water electrical conductivity concentration was 105  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  based on 248 samples collected between April 2009 and December 2013.

- (3) **Sulfate.** Effluent and receiving water monitoring data for sulfate is not available.
- (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows a maximum annual average effluent total dissolved solids concentration of 249 mg/L, with a range from 240 mg/L to 259 mg/L based on three samples collected between January 2013 and December 2013. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Upstream receiving water data for total dissolved solids is not available.

Order R5-2009-0004 included an annual average effluent limitation for electrical conductivity of 700  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ , and required the Discharger to prepare and implement a Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan. The Discharger's 23 December 2009 *Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan for the Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant* (Robertson-Bryan, Inc.) indicated that the salinity of the water supply is low, and that sources of salinity in the effluent are from residential uses and chemical additions, which is optimized with automated monitoring and dose control systems. The Plan concluded that opportunities to control salinity sources were limited, but suggested that the conversion to UV disinfection would potentially reduce the effluent salinity. Prior to conversion to UV disinfection in the years 2010 through 2012, the annual average effluent electrical conductivity concentration ranged from 505  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  to 547  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ . Following the conversion to UV disinfection, the annual average salinity concentrations decreased in 2013 to an average concentration of 407  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ . Based on the relatively low reported salinity, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity, and the effluent limitation for electrical conductivity has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet). In order to ensure that the Discharger will continue to control the discharge of salinity, this Order includes a requirement to update and continue to implement the salinity evaluation and minimization plan.

- b. **Constituents with Reasonable Potential.** The Central Valley Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality standard for ammonia,  $\text{BOD}_5$ , mercury, nitrate plus nitrite, pathogens, pH, total coliform organisms, and TSS. WQBEL's for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

- i. **Ammonia**

- (a) **WQO.** The 1999 USEPA National Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total ammonia (the "1999 Criteria"), recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based

on pH and temperature. USEPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. USEPA found that as pH increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia increased. Salmonids were more sensitive to acute toxicity effects than other species. However, while the acute toxicity of ammonia was not influenced by temperature, it was found that invertebrates and young fish experienced increasing chronic toxicity effects with increasing temperature.

The USEPA recently published national recommended water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life from the toxic effects of ammonia in freshwater (the "2013 Criteria")<sup>1</sup>. The 2013 Criteria is an update to USEPA's 1999 Criteria, and varies based on pH and temperature. Although the 2013 Criteria reflects the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia to certain freshwater aquatic life, including new toxicity data on sensitive freshwater mussels in the Family Unionidae, the species tested for development of the 2013 Criteria may not be present in some Central Valley waterways. The 2013 Criteria document therefore states that, "*unionid mussel species are not prevalent in some waters, such as the arid west ...*" and provides that, "*In the case of ammonia, where a state demonstrates that mussels are not present on a site-specific basis, the recalculation procedure may be used to remove the mussel species from the national criteria dataset to better represent the species present at the site.*"

The Central Valley Water Board issued a 3 April 2014 *California Water Code Section 13267 Order for Information: 2013 Final Ammonia Criteria for Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life* (13267 Order) requiring the Discharger to either participate in an individual or group study to determine the presence of mussels or submit a method of compliance for complying with effluent limitations calculated assuming mussels present using the 2013 Criteria. The Discharger submitted a 15 July 2014 letter to the Central Valley Water Board indicating their participation in the Central Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA) Freshwater Collaborative Mussel Study. Studies are currently underway to determine how the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia reflected in the 2013 Criteria can be implemented in the Central Valley Region as part of a Basin Planning effort to adopt nutrient and ammonia objectives. Until the Basin Planning process is completed, the Central Valley Water Board will continue to implement the 1999 Criteria to interpret the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.0, as discussed in section IV.C.3.b.v of this Fact Sheet. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an organisms, a pH value of 8.0 was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion was 5.41 mg/L (as N).

A chronic criterion was calculated for each day when paired temperature data and pH were measured using downstream receiving water data for

---

<sup>1</sup> *Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Freshwater*, published August 2013 [EPA 822-R-13-001]

temperature and pH. Rolling 30-day average criteria were calculated from downstream receiving water data using the criteria calculated for each day and the minimum observed 30-day average criterion was established as the applicable 30-day average chronic criterion, or 30-day CCC. The most stringent 30-day CCC was 1.46 mg/L (as N). The 4-day average concentration is derived in accordance with the U.S. EPA criterion as 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. Based on the 30-day CCC of 1.46 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 3.64 mg/L.

- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that, without treatment, would be harmful to fish and would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore exists and effluent limitations are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director 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.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Ammonia is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" U.S. EPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" With regard to POTW's, U.S. EPA recommends that, "*POTW's should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.*" (TSD, p. 50)

Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger currently uses nitrification to

remove ammonia from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream. Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. Discharges of ammonia in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Although the Discharger nitrifies the discharge, inadequate or incomplete nitrification creates the potential for ammonia to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for ammonia and WQBEL's are required.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** The Central Valley Water Board calculates WQBEL's in accordance with SIP procedures for non-CTR constituents, and ammonia is a non-CTR constituent. The SIP procedure assumes a 4-day averaging period for calculating the long-term average discharge condition (LTA). However, U.S. EPA recommends modifying the procedure for calculating permit limits for ammonia using a 30-day averaging period for the calculation of the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC. Therefore, while the LTAs corresponding to the acute and 4-day chronic criteria were calculated according to SIP procedures, the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period. The lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day CCC, and 30-day CCC is then selected for deriving the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and the average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL). The remainder of the WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures. This Order contains a final AMEL and AWEL for ammonia of 1.8 mg/L and 3.9 mg/L, respectively, based on the NAWQC.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Based on 248 samples collected between April 2009 and December 2013, the maximum effluent ammonia concentration was 2.62 mg/L and the maximum observed monthly average ammonia concentration was 0.95 mg/L, which are below the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with this effluent limitation is feasible.

ii. **Mercury**

- (a) **WQO.** The current NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life, continuous concentration, for mercury is 0.77 µg/L (30-day average, chronic criteria). The CTR contains a human health criterion (based on a threshold dose level causing neurological effects in infants) of 0.050 µg/L for waters from which both water and aquatic organisms are consumed. Both values are controversial and subject to change. In 40 C.F.R. part 131, U.S. EPA acknowledges that the human health criteria may not be protective of some aquatic or endangered species and that "*...more stringent mercury limits may be determined and implemented through use of the State's narrative criterion.*" In the CTR, U.S. EPA reserved the mercury criteria for freshwater and aquatic life and may adopt new criteria at a later date.

- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for mercury was 0.00369 µg/L based on 19 samples collected between April 2009 and December 2013. Upstream receiving water data for mercury is not available. Therefore, the effluent discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR criteria for mercury. However, mercury bioaccumulates in fish tissue and, therefore, the discharge of mercury to the receiving water may contribute to exceedances of the narrative toxicity objective and impact beneficial uses. The discharge of mercury to surface waters in the Central Valley draining to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is being limited in order to protect the beneficial uses of the Delta.
- (c) **WQBEL's.** Order R5-2009-0004 contained a monthly mercury mass-based effluent limitation of 0.0021 lbs/month. For this Order, the averaging period for the mass-based effluent limitation has been revised to be consistent with performance-based mass limitations assigned other recently adopted permits in the region. Therefore, this Order contains a performance-based mass effluent limitation of 0.025 lbs/year for mercury, based on the previous monthly mass limitation. This limitation is based on maintaining the mercury loading until a TMDL is established or U.S. EPA develops mercury standards that are protective of human health. If U.S. EPA develops new water quality standards for mercury, this permit may be reopened and the effluent limitations adjusted.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The effluent limitation is based on Facility performance. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with this effluent limitation is feasible.

iii. **Nitrate and Nitrite**

- (a) **WQO.** DDW has adopted Primary MCL's for the protection of human health for nitrite and nitrate that are equal to 1 mg/L and 10 mg/L (measured as nitrogen), respectively. DDW has also adopted a Primary MCL of 10 mg/L for the sum of nitrate and nitrite, measured as nitrogen.  
  
U.S. EPA has developed a Primary MCL and an MCL goal of 1 mg/L for nitrite (as nitrogen). For nitrate, U.S. EPA has developed Drinking Water Standards (10 mg/L as Primary MCL) and NAWQC for protection of human health (10 mg/L for non-cancer health effects).
- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that, if untreated, will be harmful to fish and will violate the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. This Order, therefore, requires removal of ammonia (i.e., nitrification). Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrate and nitrite, and will result in effluent nitrate concentrations above the Primary MCL for nitrate plus nitrite. Nitrate concentrations in a drinking water supply above the Primary MCL threatens the health of human fetuses and newborn babies by reducing the oxygen-carrying capacity of the blood (methemoglobinemia). Reasonable potential for nitrate and nitrite therefore exists and WQBEL's are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either*

*conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director 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.”* For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Nitrate and nitrite are not priority pollutants. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, *“State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s discharging to contact recreational waters).”* U.S. EPA’s TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, *“When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.”* With regard to POTW’s, U.S. EPA recommends that, *“POTW’s should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.”* (TSD, p. 50)

The concentration of nitrogen in raw domestic wastewater is sufficiently high that the resultant treated wastewater has a reasonable potential to exceed or threaten to exceed the Primary MCL for nitrate plus nitrite unless the wastewater is treated for nitrogen removal, and therefore an effluent limit for nitrate plus nitrite is required. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger currently uses nitrification/denitrification to remove ammonia, nitrite, and nitrate from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete denitrification may result in the discharge of nitrate and/or nitrite to the receiving stream. Discharges of nitrate plus nitrite in concentrations that exceed the Primary MCL would violate the Basin Plan narrative chemical constituents objective. Although the Discharger denitrifies the discharge, inadequate or incomplete denitrification creates the potential for nitrate and nitrite to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCL. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for nitrate plus nitrite and WQBEL’s are required.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** This Order contains a final AMEL for nitrate plus nitrite of 10 mg/L (total as N) and an AWEL of 20 mg/L (total as N), based on the Primary MCL. These effluent limitations are included in this Order to assure the treatment process adequately nitrifies and denitrifies the waste stream to protect the beneficial use of municipal and domestic supply.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Based on monitoring data collected between April 2009 and December 2013, the maximum observed monthly average nitrate plus nitrite concentration was 10 mg/L and the maximum observed weekly average nitrate plus nitrite concentration was 17.1 mg/L. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iv. **Pathogens**

- (a) **WQO.** DDW has developed reclamation criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22), for the reuse of wastewater. Title 22 requires that for spray irrigation of food crops, parks, playgrounds, schoolyards, and other areas of similar public access, wastewater be adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, and filtered, and that the effluent total coliform levels not exceed 2.2 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median; 23 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period; and 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

Title 22 also requires that recycled water used as a source of water supply for non-restricted recreational impoundments be disinfected tertiary recycled water that has been subjected to conventional treatment. A non-restricted recreational impoundment is defined as “...an impoundment of recycled water, in which no limitations are imposed on body-contact water recreational activities.” Title 22 is not directly applicable to surface waters; however, the Central Valley Water Board finds that it is appropriate to apply an equivalent level of treatment to that required by the DDW's reclamation criteria because the receiving water is used for irrigation of agricultural land and for contact recreation purposes. The stringent disinfection criteria of Title 22 are appropriate since the undiluted effluent may be used for the irrigation of food crops and/or for body-contact water recreation. Coliform organisms are intended as an indicator of the effectiveness of the entire treatment train and the effectiveness of removing other pathogens.

- (b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently contains human pathogens that threaten human health and life, and constitute a threatened pollution and nuisance under CWC section 13050 if discharged untreated to the receiving water. Reasonable potential for pathogens therefore exists and WQBEL's are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director 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.” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Pathogens are not priority pollutants. Therefore, the

Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" U.S. EPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" (TSD, p. 50)

The beneficial uses of Deer Creek include municipal and domestic supply, water contact recreation, and agricultural irrigation supply, and there is, at times, less than 20:1 dilution. To protect these beneficial uses, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the wastewater must be disinfected and adequately treated to prevent disease. Although the Discharger provides disinfection, inadequate or incomplete disinfection creates the potential for pathogens to be discharged. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for pathogens and WQBEL's are required.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** In accordance with the requirements of Title 22, this Order includes effluent limitations for total coliform organisms of 2.2 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median; 23 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period; and 240 MPN/100 mL as an instantaneous maximum.

The tertiary treatment process, or equivalent, is capable of reliably treating wastewater to a turbidity level of 2 nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) as a daily average. Failure of the filtration system such that virus removal is impaired would normally result in increased particles in the effluent, which result in higher effluent turbidity. Turbidity has a major advantage for monitoring filter performance. Coliform testing, by comparison, is not conducted continuously and requires several hours, to days, to identify high coliform concentrations. Therefore, to ensure compliance with the DDW recommended Title 22 disinfection criteria, weekly average specifications are impracticable for turbidity. This Order includes operational specifications for turbidity of 2 NTU as a daily average; 5 NTU, not to be exceeded more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period; and 10 NTU as an instantaneous maximum.

This Order contains effluent limitations for BOD<sub>5</sub>, total coliform organisms, and TSS and requires a tertiary level of treatment, or equivalent, necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The Central Valley Water Board has previously considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Final WQBEL's for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. BOD<sub>5</sub> is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The tertiary treatment standards for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the tertiary treatment process. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. The application of tertiary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed. Therefore, this Order requires AMEL's for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS of 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of a tertiary system. In addition to the average weekly effluent limitations (AWEL's) and AMEL's, MDEL's for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. The MDEL's of 30 mg/L from Order R5-2009-0004 have been revised to 20 mg/L to reflect the technical capability of the tertiary process and to be consistent with effluent limitations established in NPDES permits for other tertiary treatment facilities in the Central Valley Region.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Facility utilizes a filtration and UV disinfection system which was designed to achieve Title 22 criteria. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

v. **pH**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the "...pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5."
- (b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently has variable pH. Additionally, some wastewater treatment processes can increase or decrease wastewater pH which if not properly controlled, would violate the Basin Plan's numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, reasonable potential exists for pH and WQBEL's are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director 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.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. pH is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used

professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" U.S. EPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" (TSD, p. 50)

The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Based on 1,736 samples collected between April 2009 and December 2013, the maximum pH reported was 7.95 and the minimum was 6.53. Although the Discharger has proper pH controls in place, the pH for the Facility's influent varies due to the nature of municipal sewage, which provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, WQBEL's for pH are required in this Order.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** Order R5-2009-0004 contained instantaneous minimum and maximum effluent limitations of 6.5 and 8.0 for pH. The maximum effluent limitation of 8.0 is more stringent than required by the Basin Plan pH objective and was based on the treatment capabilities of the Facility. Consistent with Order R5-2009-0004, this Order includes instantaneous minimum and maximum effluent limitations of 6.5 and 8.0 for pH.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the range of observed pH performance levels is within the bounds of the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

#### 4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. This Order includes WQBEL's for ammonia, BOD<sub>5</sub>, mercury, nitrate plus nitrite, pH, total coliform organisms, and TSS. The general methodology for calculating WQBEL's based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.5.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.
- b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from section 1.4 of the SIP:

$$ECA = C + D(C - B) \text{ where } C > B, \text{ and}$$

$$ECA = C \text{ where } C \leq B$$

where:

- ECA = effluent concentration allowance
- D = dilution credit
- C = the priority pollutant criterion/objective
- B = the ambient background concentration.

According to the SIP, the ambient background concentration (B) in the equation above shall be the observed maximum with the exception that an ECA calculated from a priority pollutant criterion/objective that is intended to protect human health from carcinogenic effects shall use the arithmetic mean concentration of the ambient background samples. For ECA's based on MCL's, which implement the Basin Plan's chemical constituents objective and are applied as annual averages, an arithmetic mean is also used for B due to the long-term basis of the criteria.

- c. **Basin Plan Objectives and MCL's.** For WQBEL's based on site-specific numeric Basin Plan objectives or MCL's, the effluent limitations are applied directly as the ECA as either an MDEL, AMEL, or average annual effluent limitations, depending on the averaging period of the objective.
- d. **Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** WQBEL's based on acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria are calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECA's are converted to equivalent long-term averages (i.e.  $LTA_{acute}$  and  $LTA_{chronic}$ ) using statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.
- e. **Human Health Criteria.** WQBEL's based on human health criteria, are also calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The AMEL is set equal to ECA and a statistical multiplier was used to calculate the MDEL.

$$AMEL = mult_{AMEL} \left[ \min \left( \overbrace{M_A ECA_{acute}^{LTA_{acute}}}, M_C ECA_{chronic} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL = mult_{MDEL} \left[ \min \left( M_A ECA_{acute}, \underbrace{M_C ECA_{chronic}}_{LTA_{chronic}} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL_{HH} = \left( \frac{mult_{MDEL}}{mult_{AMEL}} \right) AMEL_{HH}$$

where:

- $mult_{AMEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL
- $mult_{MDEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL
- $M_A$  = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to  $LTA_{acute}$
- $M_C$  = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to  $LTA_{chronic}$

**Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations  
 Discharge Point 001**

**Table F-17. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	58	86	115	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	58	86	115	--	--
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>						
Mercury, Total Recoverable	lbs/year	0.025 <sup>2</sup>	--	--	--	--
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>						
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.8	3.9	--	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	10	22	--	--	--
Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	10	20	--	--	--
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	2.2 <sup>3</sup>	23 <sup>4</sup>	--	240

<sup>1</sup> Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.69 MGD.

<sup>2</sup> The total annual mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.025 pounds/year for a calendar year.

<sup>3</sup> Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.

<sup>4</sup> Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

**5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)**

For compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct whole effluent toxicity testing for acute and chronic toxicity, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, section V). This Order also contains effluent limitations for acute toxicity and requires the Discharger to implement best management practices to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity.

- a. **Acute Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, “...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate...”.

For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Acute toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA. U.S. EPA’s

September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s discharging to contact recreational waters).*” Although the discharge has been consistently in compliance with the acute effluent limitations, the Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater containing ammonia and other acutely toxic pollutants. Acute toxicity effluent limits are required to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

U.S. EPA Region 9 provided guidance for the development of acute toxicity effluent limitations in the absence of numeric water quality objectives for toxicity in its document titled "Guidance for NPDES Permit Issuance", dated February 1994. In section B.2. "Toxicity Requirements" (pgs. 14-15) it states that, "*In the absence of specific numeric water quality objectives for acute and chronic toxicity, the narrative criterion 'no toxics in toxic amounts' applies. Achievement of the narrative criterion, as applied herein, means that ambient waters shall not demonstrate for acute toxicity: 1) less than 90% survival, 50% of the time, based on the monthly median, or 2) less than 70% survival, 10% of the time, based on any monthly median. For chronic toxicity, ambient waters shall not demonstrate a test result of greater than 1 TUc.*" Accordingly, effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in this Order as follows:

**Acute Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

- Minimum for any one bioassay ----- 70%
- Median for any three consecutive bioassays ----- 90%

- b. **Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.)

**Table F-18. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results**

Date	Fathead Minnow <i>Pimephales promelas</i>		Water Flea <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		Green Algae <i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
21 April 2009	1	1	1	1	1
6 October 2009	1	1	1	1	1.3
12 April 2010	1	1	1	1	1
4 October 2010	1	1	1	1	1
25 April 2011	1	1	1	1	1
12 December 2011	1	1	1	1	1
23 April 2012	1	1	1	1	1
23 October 2012	1	1	1	1	1.3 <sup>2</sup>
8 April 2013	1	1	1	1	1
22 October 2013	1	1	1	1	1.3 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Algal cell density in 100% effluent was significantly reduced from cell density in the lab control.

<sup>2</sup> Significantly reduced from receiving water control in first reading, but 1 TUc when re-suspended.

No dilution has been granted for the chronic condition. Therefore, chronic toxicity testing results exceeding 1 chronic toxicity unit (TUc) demonstrates the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Chronic toxicity to *S. capricornutum* was observed in four of 10 semi-annual samples. However, the results were not provided in the appropriate units (NOEC or TUc) for the April 2009 sample, so toxicity, if any, could not be quantified. For the remaining three tests the samples were re-suspended (by shaking the sample container) then retested. These retested samples showed no toxicity.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires annual chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, the Special Provision in section VI.C.2.a of the Order includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) initiation if toxicity is demonstrated.

Numeric chronic WET effluent limitations have not been included in this Order. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region<sup>1</sup> that contained numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petition, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, *"In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits."* The process to revise the SIP is currently underway. Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limits in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the toxicity control provisions in the SIP are under revision it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. Therefore, this Order requires that the Discharger meet best management practices for compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, as allowed under 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(k).

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, the Discharger is required to conduct chronic WET testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, section V). Furthermore, the Special Provision contained at VI.C.2.a of this Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates toxicity exceeding the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE workplan. The numeric toxicity monitoring

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Matter of the Review of Own Motion of Waste Discharge Requirements Orders R4-2002-0121 [NPDES No. CA0054011] and R4-2002-0123 [NPDES NO. CA0055119] and Time Schedule Orders R4-2002-0122 and R4-2002-0124 for Los Coyotes and Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plants Issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1496 AND 1496(a).

trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

#### **D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations**

##### **1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations**

40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(2) allows pollutants that are limited in terms of mass to additionally be limited in terms of other units of measurement. This Order includes effluent limitations expressed in terms of mass and concentration. In addition, pursuant to the exceptions to mass limitations provided in 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1), some effluent limitations are not expressed in terms of mass, such as pH and temperature, and when the applicable standards are expressed in terms of concentration (e.g., CTR criteria and MCL's) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Mass-based effluent limitations have been established in this Order for ammonia, BOD<sub>5</sub>, and TSS because they are oxygen demanding substances. Except for the pollutants listed above, mass-based effluent limitations are not included in this Order for pollutant parameters for which effluent limitations are based on water quality objectives and criteria that are concentration-based.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the design flow (average dry weather flow) permitted in section IV.A.1.e of this Order.

##### **2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations**

40 C.F.R. section 122.45(d) requires AWEL's and AMEL's for POTW's unless impracticable. For BOD<sub>5</sub>, pH, and TSS, AWEL's have been replaced or supplemented with effluent limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. The rationale for using shorter averaging periods for these constituents is discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

##### **3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements**

The CWA specifies that a revised permit may not include effluent limitations that are less stringent than the previous permit unless a less stringent limitation is justified based on exceptions to the anti-backsliding provisions contained in CWA sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l).

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in Order R5-2009-0004, with the exception of effluent limitations for chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, electrical conductivity, nitrite, nitrate plus nitrite (mass limitation only), and total coliform organisms (MDEL only). The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in Order R5-2009-0004. This relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

- a. **CWA sections 402(o)(1) and 303(d)(4).** CWA section 402(o)(1) prohibits the establishment of less stringent WQBEL's "except in compliance with Section 303(d)(4)." CWA section 303(d)(4) has two parts: paragraph (A) which applies to nonattainment waters and paragraph (B) which applies to attainment waters.
  - i. For waters where standards are not attained, CWA section 304(d)(4)(A) specifies that any effluent limit based on a TMDL or other WLA may be revised

only if the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limits based on such TMDL's or WLAs will assure the attainment of such water quality standards.

- ii. For attainment waters, CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) specifies that a limitation based on a water quality standard may be relaxed where the action is consistent with the antidegradation policy.

Deer Creek is considered an attainment water for chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, electrical conductivity, nitrite, nitrate plus nitrite, and total coliform organisms because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for these constituents<sup>1</sup>. As discussed in section IV.D.4, below, removal and relaxation of the effluent limits complies with federal and state antidegradation requirements. Thus, removal of the effluent limitations for chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, electrical conductivity, nitrite, and nitrate plus nitrite (mass limitation only) and relaxation of the effluent limitations for total coliform organisms from Order R5-2009-0004 meets the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

- b. **CWA section 402(o)(2).** CWA section 402(o)(2) provides several exceptions to the anti-backsliding regulations. CWA section 402(o)(2)(B)(i) allows a renewed, reissued, or modified permit to contain a less stringent effluent limitation for a pollutant if information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance.

As described further in section IV.C.3.a of this Fact Sheet, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2009-0004 was issued indicates that chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, electrical conductivity, and nitrite do not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in the receiving water. The updated information that supports the relaxation of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

- i. **Chlorine Residual.** The Discharger converted from chlorine disinfection to UV disinfection on 30 December 2012. Chlorine has not been detected in the effluent since August 2010. Therefore, the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.
- ii. **Chlorodibromomethane.** Effluent monitoring data collected between January 2013 and December 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR human health criteria.
- iii. **Dichlorobromomethane.** Effluent monitoring data collected between January 2013 and December 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR human health criteria.
- iv. **Electrical Conductivity.** Effluent monitoring data collected between January 2013 and December 2013 indicates that the discharge does not

---

<sup>1</sup> "The exceptions in Section 303(d)(4) address both waters in attainment with water quality standards and those not in attainment, i.e., waters on the section 303(d) impaired waters list." State Water Board Order WQ 2008-0006, Berry Petroleum Company, Poso Creek/McVan Facility.

demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality objectives.

- v. **Nitrite.** Effluent monitoring data collected between April 2009 and December 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Primary MCL.

Thus, removal of the effluent limitations for chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, electrical conductivity, and nitrite from Order R5-2009-0004 is in accordance with CWA section 402(o)(2)(B)(i), which allows for the removal or relaxation of effluent limitations based on information that was not available at the time of permit issuance.

- c. **Mass Limitations.** Order R5-2009-0004 established a final mass-based effluent limitations for nitrate plus nitrite. 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1)(ii) states that mass limitations are not required when applicable standards and limitations are expressed in terms of other units of measurement. The numerical effluent limitation for nitrate plus nitrite established in this Order is based on water quality standards and objectives, which are expressed in terms of concentration. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 122.25(f)(1)(ii), expressing the effluent limitations in terms of concentration is in accordance with Federal Regulations. Compliance with the concentration-based limit will ensure that significantly less mass of the pollutants is discharged to the receiving water. Discontinuing mass-based effluent limitations for nitrate plus nitrite is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16. Any impact on existing water quality will be insignificant. Therefore, relaxation of effluent limitations is allowed under CWA section 303(d)(4).
- d. **Bypass of UV Disinfection System.** Order R5-2009-0004 contained Discharge Prohibition III.E. that stated, "*The Discharger shall not bypass the Ultraviolet (UV) disinfection system once operational prior to discharge to the receiving water except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. (Attachment D). 'Bypass' for preventive or operational maintenance is not allowed unless it meets the conditions of Section I.G.3 (Attachment D).*" The UV system became operational on 30 December 2012 and all effluent discharges hydraulically must flow through the UV system before being discharged. Furthermore, the prohibition is duplicative of Prohibition III.B, which prohibits bypasses of any portion of the treatment facility, including the UV disinfection system. Therefore, removal of the prohibition does not violate anti-backsliding requirements.

#### 4. Antidegradation Policies

This Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to the receiving water. Therefore, a complete antidegradation analysis is not necessary. The Order requires compliance with applicable federal technology-based standards and with WQBEL's where the discharge could have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards. The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

This Order removes effluent limitations for chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, electrical conductivity, and nitrite based on updated monitoring data demonstrating that the effluent does not cause or contribute to an exceedance of

the applicable water quality criteria or objectives in the receiving water. This Order also relaxes the MDEL for total coliform organisms to be consistent with Title 22 criteria. The removal and relaxation of WQBEL's for these parameters will not result in an increase in pollutant concentration or loading, a decrease in the level of treatment or control, or a reduction of water quality. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the effluent limitations does not result in an allowed increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving water. Thus, the removal and relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68 16.

**5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants**

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBEL's for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on flow and percent removal requirements for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. Restrictions on these parameters are discussed in section IV.B of this Fact Sheet. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards. These limitations are not more stringent than required by the CWA.

WQBEL's have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant WQBEL's were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The procedures for calculating the individual WQBEL's for priority pollutants are based on the CTR implemented by the SIP, which was approved by U.S. EPA on 18 May 2000. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by U.S. EPA prior to 30 May 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to U.S. EPA prior to 30 May 2000, but not approved by U.S. EPA before that date, are nonetheless "applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA" pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

**Summary of Final Effluent Limitations  
Discharge Point 001**

**Table F-19. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis <sup>1</sup>
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Average Dry Weather Flow	MGD	0.69 <sup>2</sup>	--	--	--	--	DC
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>							
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--	TTC
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	58	86	115	--	--	
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	CFR
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0	BP, PB

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis <sup>1</sup>
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--	TTC
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	58	86	115	--	--	
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	CFR
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>							
Mercury, Total Recoverable	lbs/year	0.025 <sup>4</sup>	--	--	--	--	PB
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>							
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.8	3.9	--	--	--	NAWQC
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	10	22	--	--	--	
Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	10	20	--	--	--	MCL
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	2.2 <sup>5</sup>	23 <sup>6</sup>	--	240	Title 22
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	70 <sup>7</sup> /90 <sup>8</sup>	--	--	--	--	BP

<sup>1</sup> DC – Based on the design capacity of the Facility.  
TTC – Based on tertiary treatment capability. These effluent limitations reflect the capability of a properly operated tertiary treatment plant.  
CFR – Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 C.F.R. part 133.  
BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.  
PB – Based on Facility performance.  
NAWQC – Based on U.S. EPA's National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.  
MCL – Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.  
Title 22 – Based on DDW Reclamation Criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22).  
<sup>2</sup> The average dry weather flow shall not exceed 0.69 MGD.  
<sup>3</sup> Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.69 MGD.  
<sup>4</sup> The total annual mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.025 pounds/year for a calendar year.  
<sup>5</sup> Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.  
<sup>6</sup> Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.  
<sup>7</sup> 70% minimum survival for any one bioassay.  
<sup>8</sup> 90 % median for any three consecutive bioassays.

- E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable**
- F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable**
- G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable**

**V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

**A. Surface Water**

1. CWA section 303(a-c), requires states to adopt water quality standards, including criteria where they are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Central Valley Water Board adopted water quality criteria as water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan states that “[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Water Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains receiving surface water limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative

water quality objectives for bacteria, biostimulatory substances, color, chemical constituents, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, suspended sediment, settleable substances, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity.

- a. **pH.** Order R5-2009-0004 established a receiving water limitation for pH specifying that discharges from the Facility shall not cause the ambient pH to change by more than 0.5 units based on the water quality objective for pH in the Basin Plan. The Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to delete the portion of the pH water quality objective that limits the change in pH to 0.5 units and the allowance of averaging periods for pH. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA. Consistent with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order does not require a receiving water limitation for pH change.

In Finding No. 14 of Resolution R5-2007-0136 the Central Valley Water Board found that the change in the pH receiving water objective is consistent with the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, in that the changes to water quality objectives (i) consider maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 C.F.R. § 131.12).

Ammonia is the only constituent in the discharge regulated by this Order directly related to pH. The fixed ammonia effluent limitations in this Order are based on reasonable worst-case conditions. Although ammonia criteria are based on pH, and the pH receiving water limitations are more lenient in this Order than in the previous permit, the fixed ammonia limits are developed to protect under worst-case pH conditions. Therefore the relaxation of the pH receiving water limitation will protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses nor result in water quality less than described in applicable policies. The relaxation of the receiving water limitation is not expected to cause other impacts on water quality. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the pH receiving water limitation (i) is to the maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 C.F.R. § 131.12).

The revised receiving water limitation for pH, which is based on the amendment to the Basin Plan's pH water quality objective, reflects current scientifically supported pH requirements for the protection of aquatic life and other beneficial uses. The revised receiving water limitation for pH is more consistent with the current U.S. EPA recommended criteria and is fully protective of aquatic life and the other beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. Changes in pH when pH is maintained within the range of 6.5 to 8.5 are neither beneficial nor adverse and, therefore, are not considered to be degradation in water quality. Attempting to restrict pH changes to 0.5 pH units would incur substantial costs without demonstrable benefits to beneficial uses. Thus, any changes in pH that would occur under the revised pH limitation would not only be protective of beneficial uses, but also would be consistent with maximum benefit to people of the State. Therefore the proposed amendment will not violate antidegradation policies.

- b. **Temperature.** Order R5-2009-0004 included an effluent limitation for temperature based on the Basin Plan objective, which requires that discharges shall not cause “*The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F.*” Order R5-2009-0004 also required the Discharger to conduct a study to determine the appropriate temperature thresholds downstream of the discharge. The Discharger submitted an 8 July 2013 *Receiving Water Temperature Study for the Nevada County Sanitation District 1 Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant* (Temperature Study). The Temperature Study evaluated weekly upstream and downstream receiving water data from May 2009 through February 2013, which showed that all but three downstream temperature measurements complied with the Basin Plan objective. The three November 2009 exceedances were attributed to abnormally low receiving water flows in the creek. The study also evaluated continuous receiving water monitoring data collected over a 16-month period (May 2011 to January 2013, excluding June through September 2012 due to instrument problems), which showed the downstream temperature was in compliance with the Basin Plan objective 98% of the time. In the cases where the downstream temperature exceeded, it was attributed to rapid changes in upstream receiving water temperatures mostly from Lake Wildwood dam releases approximately 1,800 feet upstream of the discharge. The Temperature Study concluded that the Basin Plan objective is the appropriate temperature threshold, and that effluent temperatures have little impact on downstream conditions. Based on the results of the Discharger’s Temperature Study, this Order retains the receiving water limitation for temperature. This Order also allows for a 1-month averaging period, which should account for short-term intermittent temperature changes attributed to natural stream effects such as upstream dam releases.
- c. **Turbidity.** Order R5-2009-0004 established a receiving water limitation for turbidity specifying that discharges from the Facility shall not cause the turbidity to increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTU based on the water quality objective for turbidity in the Basin Plan. The Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to limit turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA. Consistent with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order limits turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU.

In Finding No. 14 of Resolution R5-2007-0136 the Central Valley Water Board found that the change in the turbidity receiving water objective is consistent with the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, in that the changes to water quality objectives (i) consider maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 C.F.R. § 131.12).

This Order includes operational specifications that require the Discharger to operate the treatment system to insure that turbidity shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, and 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24 hour period, and 10 NTU, at any time. Because this Order limits the average daily discharge of turbidity to 2 NTU, the Order will be protective of the receiving water under all natural background conditions as defined in the Basin Plan’s revised water quality objective for turbidity. The relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation will protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses and will not unreasonably affect

present and anticipated beneficial uses nor result in water quality less than described in applicable policies. The relaxation of the receiving water limitation is not expected to cause other impacts on water quality. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation (i) is to the maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 C.F.R. § 131.12).

The revised receiving water limitation for turbidity, which is based on the amendment to the Basin Plan's turbidity water quality objective, reflects current scientifically supported turbidity requirements for the protection of aquatic life and other beneficial uses and, therefore, will be fully protective of aquatic life and the other beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. Changes in turbidity allowed by the revised receiving water limitation, when ambient turbidity is below 1 NTU, would not adversely affect beneficial uses and would maintain water quality at a level higher than necessary to protect beneficial uses. Restricting low-level turbidity changes further may require costly upgrades, which would not provide any additional protection of beneficial uses. Thus, any changes in turbidity that would occur under the amended turbidity receiving water limitation would not only be protective of beneficial uses, but also would be consistent with maximum benefit to people of the State. Therefore, the relaxed receiving water limitations for turbidity will not violate antidegradation policies.

#### **B. Groundwater**

The Discharger utilizes an emergency storage pond that is fully lined (the lining consists of concrete on the bottom plus the lower half of the side wall and a geomembrane liner on the remaining portion of the side walls). The emergency storage pond is not used as part of the WWTP daily operations and it is mostly used during maintenance operations. The Discharger only directs tertiary treated effluent to the storage pond plus any stored water is directed back to the headworks and through the treatment process as soon as possible. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not requiring routine groundwater monitoring.

### **VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS**

#### **A. Standard Provisions**

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42.

Sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) of 40 C.F.R. establish conditions that apply to all state-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. 40 C.F.R. section 123.25(a)(12) allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the Water Code is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference Water Code section 13387(e).

## B. Special Provisions

### 1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Mercury.** This provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order in the event mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted. In addition, this Order may be reopened if the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to NPDES permits.
- b. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a TRE. This Order may be reopened to include a numeric or narrative chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation based on that objective.
- c. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- d. **Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection Operating Specifications.** UV system operating specifications are required to ensure that the UV system is operated to achieve the required pathogen removal. UV disinfection system specifications and monitoring and reporting requirements are required to ensure that adequate UV dosage is applied to the wastewater to inactivate pathogens (e.g., viruses) in the wastewater. UV dosage is dependent on several factors such as UV transmittance, UV power setting, wastewater turbidity, and wastewater flow through the UV disinfection system. The UV specifications in this Order are based on the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) and American Water Works Association Research Foundation (AWWRF) "*Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse*" first published in December 2000 and revised as a Third Edition dated August 2012 (NWRI guidelines). If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV engineering study that identifies site-specific UV operating specifications that will achieve the virus inactivation required by Title 22 for disinfected tertiary recycled water, this Order may be reopened to modify the UV specifications.

### 2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.)

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, this provision includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if toxicity is demonstrated, except for effluent chronic toxicity for *Selenastrum capriacornutum* in which the Discharger may choose to conduct a site-specific toxicity evaluation study instead.

**Monitoring Trigger.** A numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of  $> 1$  TUc (where TUc = 100/NOEC) is applied in the provision, because this Order does not allow any dilution for the chronic condition. Therefore, a TRE is triggered when the effluent exhibits toxicity at 100% effluent.

**Accelerated Monitoring.** The provision requires accelerated WET testing when a regular WET test result exceeds the monitoring trigger, except for effluent chronic toxicity for *Selenastrum capriacornutum*. The purpose of accelerated monitoring is to determine, in an expedient manner, whether there is toxicity before requiring the implementation of a TRE. The accelerated monitoring should be performed in a timely manner, preferably taking no more than 2 to 3 months to complete.

The provision requires accelerated monitoring consisting of four chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e., one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. Guidance regarding accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation is provided in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991 (TSD). The TSD at page 118 states, "EPA recommends if toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present at levels above effluent limits more than 20 percent of the time, a TRE should be required." Therefore, four accelerated monitoring tests are required in this provision. If no toxicity is demonstrated in the four accelerated tests, then it demonstrates that toxicity is not present at levels above the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time (only 1 of 5 tests are toxic, including the initial test). However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of effluent toxicity (i.e. toxicity present exceeding the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time), the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.


See the WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart (Figure F-1), below, for further clarification of the accelerated monitoring requirements and for the decision points for determining the need for TRE initiation.

**TRE Guidance.** The Discharger updated their TRE Workplan on 10 December 2014 using guidance from the following documents:

- i. *Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants*, EPA/833-B-99/002, August 1999.
- ii. *Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs)*, EPA/600/2-88/070, April 1989.
- iii. *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures, Second Edition*, EPA 600/6-91/003, February 1991.
- iv. *Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I*, EPA/600/6-91/005F, May 1992.
- v. *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase II Toxicity Identification Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA/600/R-92/080, September 1993.
- vi. *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase III Toxicity Confirmation Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA 600/R-92/081, September 1993.

- vii. *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms, Fifth Edition*, EPA-821-R-02-012, October 2002.
- viii. *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA-821-R-02-013, October 2002.
- ix. *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991.

**Figure F-1**  
**WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart**



**Site-specific Toxicity Evaluation Study.** The Facility serves a population of approximately 7000 and provides tertiary-level treatment of the municipal wastewater disinfected by UV treatment. There are no industrial dischargers to the Facility. The tertiary treatment process uses four parallel dual media pressure filters consisting of 30-inches total of anthracite coal over smaller silica sand media, all supported on a bed of silica gravel. The Facility's control system automatically backwashes the filters. The filter system produces low turbidity effluent at 0.5 to 1.2 NTUs on a daily average. The Discharger maintains regularly scheduled maintenance activities on the UV system recommended by the manufacture (Trojan). In addition, UV channels are flushed and drained every three weeks, and the UV banks are pulled up and out of the basins every-other month for cleaning.

The discharge is a high-quality effluent that indicates low-level toxicity at times. The discharge experienced intermittent and low level effluent chronic reproductive toxicity (less than 25% effect) to *Selenastrum capriacornutum*, and is currently engaged in a TIE to investigate the causes of toxicity, and if possible, to implement corrective actions to eliminate toxicity. If after the Discharger implements all actions possible to eliminate toxicity, or if the current TIE/TRE is inconclusive, and the discharge again exceeds the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, this provision allows the Discharger to conduct a toxicity evaluation study to investigate the cause of toxicity, individually or as part of a coordinated group effort with other dischargers that evaluate low level and intermittent toxicity in effluent disinfected by an UV system, instead of conducting accelerated monitoring or another TIE/TRE. Some studies completed within the Central Valley Region focusing on the role of the UV process in causing toxicity indicated, though not conclusively, that free radicals may play a role in the observed toxicity in effluent disinfected by a UV System (City of Woodland TIE/TRE findings from 2009-2014, Robertson-Bryan, Inc.). The Discharger has expressed interest to use peracetic acid (PAA) as part of the disinfection process at the Facility. PAA added upstream of the UV system is believed to increase disinfection efficiency through radical scavenging. (Gehr R, Wagner M, Veerasubramanian P, Payment P. Disinfection efficiency of peracetic acid, UV, and ozone after enhanced primary treatment of municipal wastewater. Water Research 37 (2003) 4573-4586; Kitis M, Disinfection of wastewater with peracetic acid: a review. Environmental International 30 (2004) 47-55; and Gori R, Caretti C. Experimental study on municipal and industrial reclaimed wastewater refinement for agricultural reuse. 2008) Therefore this provision allows the Discharger to conduct a site-specific toxicity evaluation study that evaluates the efficacy of PAA addition to the Facility's disinfection system and potential impacts to the beneficial uses of the receiving water, or another toxicity evaluation study, approved by the Executive Officer.

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

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** An Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity is required to be updated and submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to ensure adequate measures are developed and implemented by the Discharger to reduce the discharge of salinity to Deer Creek.

**4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications**

- a. **Filtration System Operating Specifications.** Turbidity is included as an operational specification as an indicator of the effectiveness of the filtration system for providing adequate disinfection. The tertiary treatment process utilized at this Facility is capable of reliably meeting a turbidity limitation of 2 NTU as a daily average. Failure of the treatment system such that virus removal is impaired would normally result in increased particles in the effluent, which result in higher effluent

turbidity and could impact UV dosage. Turbidity has a major advantage for monitoring filter performance, allowing immediate detection of filter failure and rapid corrective action. The operational specification requires that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average; 5 NTU, more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period, and an instantaneous maximum of 10 NTU.

- b. **Ultraviolet (UV) Disinfection System Operating Specifications.** This Order requires that wastewater shall be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to DDW reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3, (Title 22), or equivalent. To ensure that the UV disinfection system is operated to achieve the required pathogen removal, this Order includes effluent limits for total coliform organisms, filtration system operating specifications, and UV disinfection system operating specifications. Compliance with total coliform effluent limits alone does not ensure that pathogens in the municipal wastewater have been deactivated by the UV disinfection system. Compliance with the effluent limits and the filtration system and UV disinfection operating specifications demonstrates compliance with the equivalency to Title 22 disinfection requirement.

The NWRI guidelines include UV operating specifications for compliance with Title 22. For water recycling in accordance with Title 22, the UV system shall be an approved system included in the Treatment Technology Report for Recycled Water, December 2009 (or a later version, as applicable) published by the DDW. The UV system shall also conform to all requirements and operating specifications of the NWRI guidelines. A Memorandum dated 1 November 2004 issued by DDW to Regional Water Board executive officers recommended that provisions be included in permits for water recycling treatment plants employing UV disinfection requiring dischargers to establish fixed cleaning frequency of lamp sleeves, as well as, include provisions that specify minimum delivered UV dose that must be maintained (per the NWRI Guidelines).

For granular media filtration, the NWRI guidelines recommend a minimum hourly average UV dose of 100 mJ/cm<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, this Order includes UV operating specifications requiring a minimum hourly average UV dose of 100 mJ/cm<sup>2</sup> and a minimum hourly average UV transmittance of 55%, per the NWRI Guidelines. If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV engineering study that demonstrates a lower UV dose meets a Title 22 equivalent virus removal, this Order may be reopened to revise the UV operating specifications accordingly.

- c. **Emergency Storage Pond Operating Requirements.** The operation and maintenance specifications for the emergency storage pond are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the groundwater and to prevent discharge of wastewater that does not meet effluent limits. In addition, reporting requirements related to use of the emergency storage pond are required to monitor its use and the potential impact on groundwater.

The emergency storage pond is fully lined. The emergency storage pond is not used as part of the WWTP daily operations and it is mostly used during maintenance operations. The Discharger only directs tertiary treated effluent to the storage pond plus any stored water is directed back through the treatment process as soon as possible.

## 5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW's Only)

- a. The sludge/biosolids provisions are required to ensure compliance with State disposal requirements (Title 27, CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1, section 20005, et

seq) and USEPA sludge/biosolids use and disposal requirements at 40 CFR Part 503.

- b. The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on 2 May 2006. The Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for the General Order were amended by Water Quality Order WQ 2008-0002-EXEC on 20 February 2008. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than 1 mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMPs) and report all sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), among other requirements and prohibitions. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under Order 2006-0003-DWQ for operation of its wastewater collection system.
- c. **Anaerobically Digestible Material.** Managers of POTW's increasingly are considering the addition of organic material such as food waste, fats, oils and grease (FOG) into their anaerobic digesters for co-digestion. Benefits of accepting these materials include increasing the volume of methane and other biogases available for energy production and ensuring such materials are disposed of at the POTW instead of discharged into the collection system potentially causing sanitary sewer overflows. The State Water Board has been working with the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), and the California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) to delineate jurisdictional authority for the receipt of hauled-in anaerobically digestible material (ADM<sup>1</sup>) at POTW's for co-digestion.

CalRecycle is proposing an exclusion from Process Facility/Transfer Station permits for direct injection of ADM to POTW anaerobic digesters for co-digestion that are regulated under waste discharge requirements or NPDES permits. The proposed CalRecycle exclusion is restricted to ADM that has been prescreened, slurried, and processed/conveyed in a closed system to be co-digested with regular POTW sludge. The CalRecycle exclusion assumes that a POTW has developed Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) for the proper handling, processing, tracking, and management of the ADM received.

The Discharger currently does not accept hauled-in ADM for direct injection into its anaerobic digester for co-digestion. However, if the Discharger proposes to receive hauled-in ADM for injection into its anaerobic digester for co-digestion, this provision requires the Discharger to notify the Central Valley Water Board and develop and implement SOP's for this activity prior to initiation of the hauling. The requirements of the SOP's are discussed in Section VI.C.5.c.

## 6. Other Special Provisions

- a. Consistent with Order R5-2009-0004, this Order requires wastewater to be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to DDW reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3 (Title 22), or equivalent.

## 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

---

<sup>1</sup> CalRecycle has proposed to define "anaerobically digestible material" to include inedible kitchen grease as defined in Food and Agricultural Code section 19216, food material as defined in California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 17852 and vegetative food material.

## VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this Facility.

### A. Influent Monitoring

1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (e.g., BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS reduction requirements). The monitoring frequency for flow (continuous) has been retained from Order R5-2009-0004.
2. Order R5-2009-0004 required weekly influent monitoring for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. The Discharger has maintained compliance with the percent removal limitations during the term of Order R5-2009-0004. Therefore, this Order reduces the monitoring frequency from weekly to monthly. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to determine compliance with the applicable percent removal limitations and characterize the influent.

### B. Effluent Monitoring

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(i)(2) effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations. Effluent monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with effluent limitations, assess the effectiveness of the treatment process, and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream and groundwater.
2. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (continuous), mercury (quarterly), ammonia (weekly), and electrical conductivity (monthly) have been retained from Order R5-2009-0004 to determine compliance with effluent limitations, where applicable, and characterize the effluent for these parameters.
3. Monitoring data collected over the term of Order R5-2009-0004 for aldrin, alpha-BHC, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, diquat, gamma-BHC, methylene blue active substances, methylmercury, silver, total dissolved solids, and standard minerals did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order R5-2009-0004.
4. Order R5-2009-0004 required quarterly monitoring for carbon tetrachloride. As discussed further in section IV.C.3.a of this Fact Sheet, carbon tetrachloride has not been detected in the effluent since conversion to UV disinfection. This Order discontinues the specific monitoring requirements for carbon tetrachloride, but requires monitoring twice during the third year of the permit term as part of the Effluent Characterization monitoring required in section IX.D of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E).
5. Order R5-2009-0004 required effluent monitoring for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS three times per week. The Discharger has demonstrated compliance with the effluent limitations for these parameters during the term of Order R5-2009-0004. Therefore, this Order reduces the monitoring frequency for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS to weekly. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to determine compliance with the applicable effluent limitations and characterize the effluent.

6. Order R5-2009-0004 required monthly effluent monitoring for hardness. This Order reduces the monitoring frequency for hardness from monthly to quarterly. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to properly adjust water quality criteria for hardness-dependent metals.
7. Order R5-2009-0004 required effluent monitoring for pH and temperature daily. This Order reduces the monitoring frequency for pH and temperature to two times per week as the Discharger has demonstrated compliance with the applicable water quality objectives during the term of Order R5-2009-0004 and is only staffed 5 days per week. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to determine compliance with the applicable effluent limitations and characterize the effluent.
8. Order R5-2009-0004 required effluent monitoring for nitrate and nitrite weekly. This Order reduces the monitoring frequency for nitrate and nitrite to monthly as the Discharger has demonstrated compliance with the applicable water quality objectives during the term of Order R5-2009-0004. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to determine compliance with the applicable effluent limitations and characterize the effluent.
9. Order R5-2009-0004 required continuous monitoring for chlorine residual. On 30 December 2012, the Discharger converted from chlorine disinfection with UV disinfection. This Order requires daily monitoring for chlorine residual during periods of chlorine use in the treatment system.
10. Order R5-2009-0004 required monitoring for total coliform organisms three times per week at Monitoring Location EFF-001. This Order retains the monitoring frequency for total coliform organisms, but moves the point of compliance from Monitoring Location EFF-001 to an internal compliance point following the UV disinfection system (Monitoring Location UVS-002).
11. In accordance with section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring is required for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires effluent monitoring for priority pollutants twice during the third year of the permit term. See section IX.D of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.
12. As discussed in section II.E of this Fact Sheet, the Discharger is considering adding peracetic acid (PAA) in addition to UV disinfection to enhance disinfection at the Facility. This Order establishes daily effluent monitoring for PAA when PAA is used in the treatment system.
13. Water Code section 13176, subdivision (a), states: *“The analysis of any material required by [Water Code sections 13000-16104] shall be performed by a laboratory that has accreditation or certification pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 100825) of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 101 of the Health and Safety Code.”* DDW certifies laboratories through its Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

Section 13176 cannot be interpreted in a manner that would violate federal holding time requirements that apply to NPDES permits pursuant to the CWA. (Wat. Code §§ 13370, subd. (c), 13372, 13377.) Section 13176 is inapplicable to NPDES permits to the extent it is inconsistent with CWA requirements. (Wat. Code § 13372, subd. (a).) The holding time requirements are 15 minutes for chlorine residual, dissolved oxygen, and pH, and immediate analysis is required for temperature. (40 C.F.R. § 136.3(e), Table II) The Discharger maintains an ELAP certified laboratory on-site and conducts analysis for chlorine residual, dissolved oxygen, and pH within the required 15 minute hold times.

### C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Based on acute toxicity testing conducted during the term of Order R5-2009-0004, the discharge has been in compliance with the effluent limitations for acute toxicity. Therefore, this Order reduces the frequency for 96-hour bioassay testing from semi-annually to annually to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity. The annual acute toxicity sample is required between 1 January and 31 March and the annual chronic toxicity sample is required between 1 July and 30 September because the chronic toxicity sample also provides acute toxicity data that is spread evenly throughout the year. Therefore, the Discharger will be collecting and analyzing one acute toxicity sample and one chronic toxicity sample but will have data for two acute toxicity samples spread over the wet and dry seasons.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Based on chronic toxicity testing conducted during the term of Order R5-2009-0004, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Therefore, this Order reduces the frequency for chronic whole effluent toxicity testing from semi-annually to annually in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

### D. Receiving Water Monitoring

#### 1. Surface Water

- a. Receiving water monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.
- b. Order R5-2009-0004 required receiving water monitoring in Deer Creek 70 feet upstream of Discharge Point 001 at Monitoring Location RSW-001. This location is accessible only via a steep and eroded bank of Deer Creek. Therefore, this location is not readily accessible by the Discharger's staff and collecting routine samples is dangerous, particularly during high flow conditions in Deer Creek. Therefore, this Order moves the location of Monitoring Location RSW-001 to 850 feet upstream of Discharge Point 001, which will allow the Discharger's staff safer access and will continue to provide representative samples of the upstream receiving water outside the influence of the discharge.
- c. The receiving water monitoring frequency and sample type for temperature has been retained from Order R5-2009-0004.
- d. Order R5-2009-0004 required weekly monitoring for pH, dissolved oxygen, electrical conductivity, and turbidity. This Order reduces the monitoring frequency for these parameters to monthly as the Discharger has demonstrated compliance with the applicable water quality objectives during the term of Order R5-2009-0004. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.
- e. This Order establishes quarterly monitoring for hardness to ensure that adequate data is available to properly adjust water quality criteria for hardness-based metals.
- f. Section 1.3 of the SIP states, "*The RWQCB shall require periodic monitoring (at least once prior to the issuance and reissuance of a permit) for pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitation have been established; however, the RWQCB may choose to exempt low volume discharges, determined to have no significant adverse impact on water quality, from this monitoring requirement.*" The discharge is a minor discharge with no industrial users and is treated to a tertiary level, and thus is not expected to have a significant

adverse impact on water quality. Therefore, consistent with Order R5-2009-0004 and section 1.3 of the SIP, this Order does not require the Discharger to collect receiving water samples for analysis of priority pollutants.

**2. Groundwater – Not Applicable**

**E. Other Monitoring Requirements**

**1. Biosolids Monitoring**

Biosolids monitoring is required to ensure compliance with the biosolids disposal requirements contained in the Special Provision contained in section VI.C.5.a of this Order. Biosolids disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 C.F.R. part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation.

**2. Water Supply Monitoring**

Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater. Consistent with Order R5-2009-0004, this Order requires annual monitoring for electrical conductivity. This Order discontinues monitoring requirements for total dissolved solids and standard minerals as they are unnecessary to comply with the requirements of this Order.

**3. UV Disinfection System Monitoring**

UV system monitoring and reporting are required to ensure that the UV system is operated to adequately inactivate pathogens in the wastewater. UV disinfection system monitoring is imposed to achieve equivalency to requirements established by DDW, and the NWRI guidelines.

**4. Emergency Storage Pond Monitoring**

Order R5-2009-0004 required daily monitoring/observations for flow, freeboard, and odors for the emergency storage pond, when in use. Because the emergency storage pond is used infrequently and for short periods of time, this Order discontinues the daily monitoring requirements and instead requires the Discharger to keep a log related to the use of the pond only when wastewater that has not received tertiary treatment is stored in the emergency storage pond. The emergency storage pond monitoring is required to ensure proper operation of the storage pond.

**VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Central Valley Water Board has considered the issuance of WDR's that will serve as an NPDES permit for the Facility. As a step in the WDR's adoption process, the Central Valley Water Board staff has developed tentative WDR's and has encouraged public participation in the WDR's adoption process.

**A. Notification of Interested Parties**

The Central Valley Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the following posting of the Notice of Public Hearing at the nearest city hall or county courthouse, nearest post office (if allowed) and at the public entrance to the Facility.

The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Central Valley Water Board's website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board\\_info/meetings/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_info/meetings/)

**B. Written Comments**

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDR's as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Central Valley Water Board at the address on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Central Valley Water Board, the written comments were due at the Central Valley Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on **20 February 2015**.

**C. Public Hearing**

The Central Valley Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative WDR's during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: 16/17 April 2015  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region  
1685 "E" Street  
Fresno, CA 93706

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Central Valley Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDR's, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

**D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements**

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Central Valley Water Board regarding the final WDR's. The petition must be received by the State Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Central Valley Water Board's action:

State Water Resources Control Board  
Office of Chief Counsel  
P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public\\_notices/petitions/water\\_quality/wqpetition\\_instr.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml)

**E. Information and Copying**

The ROWD, other supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Central Valley Water Board by calling (916) 464-3291.

**F. Register of Interested Persons**

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDR's and NPDES permit should contact the Central Valley Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

**G. Additional Information**

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Josh Palmer at (916) 464-4674.

**ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS**

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	2.62	--	1.46	5.62 <sup>1</sup>	1.46 <sup>2</sup>	--	--	--	--	Yes
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	1.4	--	0.25	--	--	0.25	4.4	--	0.5	No <sup>3</sup>
Chloride	mg/L	33	--	230	860	230	--	--	--	250	No
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	<0.13	--	0.41	--	--	0.41	34	--	80 <sup>4</sup>	No
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	<0.061	--	0.56	--	--	0.56	46	--	80 <sup>4</sup>	No
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	407 <sup>5</sup>	105 <sup>5</sup>	900	--	--	--	--	--	900	No
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.00369	--	0.050	--	--	0.050	0.051	--	2	Yes <sup>6</sup>
Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	17.13	--	10	--	--	--	--	--	10	Yes
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.25	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	No
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	249 <sup>5</sup>	--	500	--	--	--	--	--	500	No

General Note: All inorganic concentrations are given as a total recoverable.

MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration

B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect

C = Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)

Water & Org = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)

Org. Only = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)

Basin Plan = Numeric Site-specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective

MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level

NA = Not Available

ND = Non-detect

Footnotes:

- (1) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 1-hr average.
- (2) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 30-day average.
- (3) See section IV.C.3.a of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F) for a discussion of the RPA results.
- (4) Represents the Primary MCL for Total Trihalomethanes which include bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, and dichlorobromomethane.
- (5) Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the MCL.
- (6) See section IV.C.3.b of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F) for a discussion of the RPA results.

**ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBEL'S**

Parameter	Units	Most Stringent Criteria			HH Calculations <sup>1</sup>			Aquatic Life Calculations <sup>1</sup>									Final Effluent Limitations	
		HH	CMC	CCC	ECA <sub>HH</sub> = AMEL <sub>HH</sub>	AMEL/MDEL Multiplier <sub>HH</sub>	MDEL <sub>HH</sub>	ECA Multiplier <sub>acute</sub>	LTA <sub>acute</sub>	ECA Multiplier <sub>chronic</sub>	LTA <sub>chronic</sub>	Lowest LTA	AMEL Multiplier <sub>95</sub>	AMEL <sub>AL</sub>	AWEL Multiplier <sub>98</sub>	AWEL <sub>AL</sub>	Lowest AMEL	Lowest AWEL
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	--	5.62	1.46	--	--	--	0.11	0.60	0.45	0.65	0.60	2.88	1.8	6.27	3.9	1.8	3.9

<sup>1</sup> As discussed in section IV.C.2.c of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F), calculation of effluent limitations for the protection of human health and aquatic life are determined without the allowance of dilution credits.