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

Tentative

ORDER NO. R5-2009-XXXX
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 as set forth in this Order:

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1
Name of Facility	Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	12622 Pleasant Valley Road
	Penn Valley, CA 95946
	Nevada County
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have classified this discharge as a **major** discharge.	

The discharge by the Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1 from the discharge points identified below is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 2. Discharge Location

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Receiving Water
001	Treated WWTP Effluent	39º, 14', 00" N	121º, 13', 22" W	Deer Creek

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on:	**<Adoption Date>**
This Order shall become effective on:	**<Effective Date>**
This Order shall expire on:	**<Expiration Date>**
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements no later than:	**180 days prior to the Order expiration date**

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **<Adoption Date>**.

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

Table of Contents

I. Facility Information 2
II. Findings 2
III. Discharge Prohibitions 2
IV. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications 2
A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 2
1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 2
2. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
3. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable 2
B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable 2
C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable 2
V. Receiving Water Limitations 2
A. Surface Water Limitations 2
B. Groundwater Limitations 2
VI. Provisions 2
A. Standard Provisions 2
B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements 2
C. Special Provisions 2
1. Reopener Provisions 2
2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements 2
3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention 2
4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications 2
5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) 2
6. Other Special Provisions 2
7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable 2
VII. Compliance Determination 2

List of Tables

Table 1. Discharger Information ..... Cover
Table 2. Discharge Location ..... Cover
Table 3. Administrative Information ..... Cover
Table 4. Facility Information 2
Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses 2
Table 6. Effluent Limitations 2

List of 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 (MRP) E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet F-1

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 4. Facility Information

Discharger	Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1
Name of Facility	Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	12622 Pleasant Valley Road
	Penn Valley, CA 95946
	Nevada County
Facility Contact, Title, and Phone	Chad McBride, Plant Operator, (530) 432-3767
Mailing Address	950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, CA 95959
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
Facility Design Flow	1.12 million gallons per day (mgd) ADWF

II. FINDINGS

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

A. Background. Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1 (hereinafter Discharger) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. R5-2002-0093 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0077828. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 19 December 2006**,** and applied for a NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to 1.12 mgd average dry weather flow (ADWF) of treated wastewater from Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant, hereinafter Facility. The application was deemed complete on 12 October 2007.

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. Facility Description. The Discharger owns and operates a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system. The treatment system at the Facility consists of preliminary screening, equalization basin, secondary treatment with anoxic basins, pre-aeration basins, oxidation ditches, clarification, mixed media filtration, disinfection with chlorine gas, and dechlorination with sulfur dioxide. Wastewater is discharged from Discharge Point 001 (see table on cover page) to the Deer Creek, a water of the United States, and a tributary to Yuba River, Englebright Dam to Feather River Hydrologic Area (515.3) within the Sacramento Hydrologic Basin. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

C. Legal Authorities. This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters. This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13260).

D. Background and Rationale for Requirements. The Regional 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 Order requirements, is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes part of the Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E are also incorporated into this Order.

E. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21100-21177.

F. Technology-based Effluent Limitations*.* Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at section 122.44, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)[1] 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 Part 133. A detailed discussion of the technology-based effluent limitations development is included in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F).

G. Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations. Section 301(b) of the CWA and 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 technology equivalence requirements, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC Section 13241 in establishing these requirements. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) mandates 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, water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) must be established using: (1) EPA

[1] All further statutory references are to title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations unless otherwise indicated.

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 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

H. Water Quality Control Plans. The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised October 2007), 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. The Basin Plan at page II-2.00 states that the "…*beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams*." The Basin Plan does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Deer Creek, but does identify present and potential uses for Yuba River, Englebright Dam to Feather River Hydrologic Area, to which Deer Creek is tributary. These beneficial uses are as follows: agricultural supply, including stock watering; hydropower generation; water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting; non-contact water recreation, including aesthetic enjoyment; commercial and sport fishing; aquaculture; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; warm migration of aquatic organisms; cold migration of aquatic organisms; warm spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; cold spawning, reproduction, and /or early development; and wildlife habitat.

In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Resources Control Board (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. Thus, as discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet, beneficial uses applicable to Deer Creek are as follows:

Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Deer Creek	**Existing:** Agricultural supply (AGR); Hydropower generation (POW); Contact (REC-1) and non-contact (REC-2) water recreation; Warm and cold freshwater habitat (WARM)(COLD); Migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR); Spawning, Reproduction, and /or Early Development (SPWN); Wildlife habitat (WILD); Ground water recharge (GWR); Freshwater replenishment (FRESH). **Potential:** Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN).

Requirements of this Order implement the Basin Plan.

I. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** USEPA adopted the NTR on December 22, 1992, and later amended it on May 4, 1995 and November 9, 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On May 18, 2000, USEPA 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 February 13, 2001. These rules contain water quality criteria for priority pollutants.

J. **State Implementation Policy.** On March 2, 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 April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005 that became effective on July 13, 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.

K. **Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements.** In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with Clean Water Act section 301 and with 40 CFR 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board has concluded that where the Regional Water Board's Basin Plan allows for schedules of compliance and the Regional Water Board is newly interpreting a narrative standard, it may include schedules of compliance in the permit to meet effluent limits that implement a narrative standard. See In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements for Avon Refinery (State Board Order WQ 2001-06 at pp. 53-55). See also Communities for a Better Environment et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, 34 Cal.Rptr.3d 396, 410 (2005). The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers includes a provision that authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES permits for water quality objectives that are adopted after the date of adoption of the Basin Plan, which was September 25, 1995 (See Basin Plan at page IV-16). Consistent with the State Water Board's Order in the CBE matter, the Regional Water Board has the discretion to include compliance schedules in NPDES permits when it is including an effluent limitation that is a "new interpretation" of a narrative water quality objective. This conclusion is also consistent with the United States Environmental Protection Agency policies and administrative decisions. See, e.g., Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy. The Regional Water Board, however, is not required to include a schedule of compliance, but may issue a Time Schedule Order pursuant to Water Code section 13300 or a Cease and Desist Order pursuant to Water Code section 13301 where it finds that the discharger is violating or threatening to violate the permit. The Regional Water Board will consider the merits of each case in determining whether it is appropriate to include a compliance schedule in a permit, and, consistent with the Basin Plan, should consider feasibility of achieving compliance, and must impose a schedule that is as short as practicable to achieve compliance with the objectives, criteria, or effluent limit based on the objective or criteria.

For CTR constituents, Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that, based on a Discharger's request and demonstration that it is infeasible for an existing Discharger to achieve immediate compliance with an effluent limitation derived from a CTR criterion, compliance schedules may be allowed in an NPDES permit. Unless an exception has been granted under section 5.3 of the SIP, a compliance schedule may not exceed 5 years from the date that the permit is issued or reissued, nor may it extend beyond 10 years from the effective date of the SIP (or May 18, 2010) to establish and comply with CTR criterion-based effluent limitations. Where a compliance schedule for a final effluent limitation that exceeds 1 year, the Order must include interim numeric limitations for that constituent or parameter. Where allowed by the Basin Plan, compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations or discharge specifications may also be granted to allow time to implement a new or revised water quality objective. This Order does not include compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations.

L. Alaska Rule. On March 30, 2000, USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised state and tribal water quality standards (WQS) become effective for CWA purposes. (40 C.F.R. § 131.21; 65 Fed. Reg. 24641 (April 27, 2000).) Under the revised regulation (also known as the Alaska rule), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after May 30, 2000, must be approved by USEPA before being used for CWA purposes. The final rule also provides that standards already in effect and submitted to USEPA by May 30, 2000 may be used for CWA purposes, whether or not approved by USEPA.

M. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants. This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD_5) and total suspended solids (TSS). The WQBELs consist of restrictions on dibromochloromethane, dichlorobromomethane, and pathogens. 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 more stringent than required by the CWA. Specifically, this Order includes effluent limitations for BOD, TSS, and pathogens that are more stringent than applicable federal standards, but that are nonetheless necessary to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses. The rationale for including these limitations is explained in the Fact Sheet. In addition, the Regional Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

WQBELs have been scientifically 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 water quality-based effluent limitations were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA

on May 1, 2001. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "*applicable water quality standards for purposes of the [Clean Water] Act*" pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the technology-based requirements of the CWA and the applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA.

N. Antidegradation Policy. 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 No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 is consistent with the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet the permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provision of section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

O. Anti-Backsliding Requirements. Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at title 40, CFR 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. Some effluent limitations in this Order are less stringent that those in the previous Order. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet this relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

P. Endangered Species Act. 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 sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. sections 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.

Q. Monitoring and Reporting. Section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. This Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.

R. Standard and Special Provisions. Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 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. The Regional Water Board has also included in this Order special provisions applicable to the Discharger. A rationale for the special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the attached Fact Sheet.

S. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law. The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, V.B, and VI.C. of this Order 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.

T. Notification of Interested Parties. The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe Waste Discharge Requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of notification are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.

U. Consideration of Public Comment. The Regional 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 of this Order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Order No. R5-2002-0093 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 federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

A. Discharge of wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in the Findings 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 California Water Code.

D. The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the collection, treatment, and 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.

E. 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 preventative or operational maintenance is not allowed unless it meets the conditions of Section I.G.3 (Attachment D.)

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 as described in the attached MRP (Attachment E):

a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 6:

Table 6. Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD 5-day @ 20 °C	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	140	280	--	--
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	140	280	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0
Dibromochloromethane[2]	µg/L	0.41	--	0.82	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane[2]	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--
Ammonia, Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	2.3		5.6		
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	1	--	--	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	9.3	--	--	--	--
Nitrite + Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	10	--	--	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	--	--	--	--

[1] Based on the design average dry weather flow of 1.12 mgd.
[2] These effluent limitations are in effect until the Discharger submits 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 discharge to surface waters.

b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of BOD 5-day 20°C and total suspended solids 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 Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:

i. 0.01 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
ii. 0.02 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.

The total residual chlorine effluent limitations are effective until the Discharger submits 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.

e. **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; and
ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, as a daily maximum.

f. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The average dry weather flow (ADWF) as defined in Section VII.E shall not exceed 1.12 mgd.

g. **Mass Limitation for Mercury.** The monthly average total recoverable mercury loading in the effluent shall not exceed 0.0021 lbs/month.

h. **Electrical Conductivity.** The annual average electrical conductivity concentration in the effluent shall not exceed 700 µmhos/cm.

2. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water Limitations

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order. 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 ten 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, raised above 8.5, nor changed by more than 0.5 units on an annual average basis.

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 USEPA 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 CFR §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 set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15.
   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 maximum contaminant levels specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) 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.

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**. The turbidity to increase as follows:

    a. More than 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU) where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTUs.
    b. More than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs.
    c. More than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs.
    d. More than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

    When wastewater is treated to a tertiary level or equivalent, a one-month averaging period may be used when determining compliance with this Receiving Surface Water Limitation for turbidity.

B. Groundwater Limitations

1. The discharge shall not cause the groundwater to exceed water quality objectives, unreasonably affect beneficial uses, or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance.

VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D of this Order.

2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions:

   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:

      - *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act, 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.

      - *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.

      - *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 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 Regional Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Regional 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 Regional 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 USEPA under Section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.

h. The discharge of any radiological, chemical or biological warfare agent or high-level, radiological waste is prohibited.

i. 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.

j. 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 Regional 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 five 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 Regional Water Board.

   iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Regional Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within ninety days of having been advised in writing by the Regional Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Regional Water Board and USEPA 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 Regional Water Board, become a condition of this Order.

k. The Discharger, upon written request of the Regional 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 Regional Water Board Standard Provision VI.A.2.m.

   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 Regional 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.

l. 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 three 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 four years, the Discharger shall notify the Regional 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 Regional Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.

m. 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.

n. Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Regional Water Board and USEPA.

o. The Discharger shall conduct analysis on any sample provided by USEPA as part of the Discharge Monitoring Quality Assurance (DMQA) program. The results of any such analysis shall be submitted to USEPA's DMQA manager.

p. 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.

q. All monitoring and analysis 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.

r. The Discharger shall file with the Regional Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in the Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to this Order.

s. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Regional 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.

t. The Regional Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the CWC, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.

u. For POTWs, 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. (CWC section 1211).

v. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, maximum daily effluent limitation, 1-hour average effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation contained in this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Regional 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 Regional Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by Attachment D, Section V.E.1 [40 CFR section 122.41(l)(6)(i)].

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements

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

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

a. 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.

b. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR section 122.62, including:

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.

c. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a 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.

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, 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 toxicity numeric monitoring trigger established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent reoccurrence 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. This Provision includes requirements for the Discharger to develop and submit a TRE Work Plan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.

i. **Initial Investigative Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Work Plan. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Order,** the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer. This should be a one to two page document including, at minimum:

a) A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that will be used to identify potential causes and sources of effluent toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency;

b) A description of the facility's methods of maximizing in-house treatment efficiency and good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in operation of the facility; and

c) A discussion of who will conduct the Toxicity Identification Evaluation, if necessary (i.e. an in-house expert or outside contractor).

ii. **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. WET testing results exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring demonstrates a pattern of toxicity and requires the Discharger to initiate a TRE to address the effluent toxicity.

iii. **Numeric Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger 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.

iv. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four (4) chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e. one test 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 (4) 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 (i.e. temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four (4) 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, and the source(s) of the toxicity are not easily identified as described in item b of this subsection, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE 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 the test results exceeding the

monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Regional Water Board including, at minimum:

1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including 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.

Within sixty (60) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board a TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Work Plan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating effluent toxicity. The TRE Work Plan must be developed in accordance with EPA guidance[2].

b. **Receiving Water Temperature Study:** The Discharger shall conduct a temperature study in Deer Creek to determine adequate temperature thresholds downstream of the discharge (R-2). The results of the study shall be submitted as part of the Report of Waste Discharge for renewal.

c. **Reuse of Municipal Wastewater Feasibility Study:** The Discharger shall evaluate the feasibility of utilizing reclaimed municipal wastewater from the new treatment facility for beneficial reuse to reduce area dependence on existing surface and groundwater water supply sources. A report containing the study conclusions of feasible wastewater reuse alternatives shall be completed and submitted **within 12 months of the adoption date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger shall prepare and implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the municipal wastewater treatment system. The plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board within **9 months** of the effective date of this Order for approval by the Executive Officer.

[2] See Attachment F (Fact Sheet) Section VII.B.2.a. for a list of EPA guidance documents that must be considered in development of the TRE Workplan.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

a. 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.

b. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.

c. 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.

d. 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.

e. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the property owned by the Discharger.

f. Wastewater contained in the emergency storage pond must meet all effluent limitations prior to discharge to Deer Creek.

g. The Discharger shall monitor use of the emergency storage pond. The Discharger shall record the following when any type of wastewater is directed to the basin:

    i. The date(s) when the wastewater is directed to the pond.

    ii. The type(s) of wastewater (e.g., untreated due to plant upset, tertiary treated) directed to the pond.

    iii. The total volume of wastewater directed.

    iv. The duration of time wastewater is collected in the pond prior to redirection back to the treatment plant, and

    The monitoring shall be submitted with the monthly self-monitoring reports required in Section XI.B of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E).

h. Turbidity Specifications Prior to Chlorination

The Discharger shall operate the treatment system to insure that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, and 5 NTU more than 5% of the time within a 24-hour, and 10 NTU, at any time.

i. Ultraviolet Disinfection (UV) System Operating Specifications

Once in operation the Discharger shall operate the UV disinfection system to provide a minimum UV dose per bank of 100 millijoules per square centimeter (mJ/cm^2) at peak daily flow, unless otherwise approved by the California Department of Public Health, and shall maintain an adequate dose for disinfection while discharging to Deer Creek, unless otherwise approved by the California Department of Public Health.

i. The Discharger shall provide continuous, reliable monitoring of flow, UV transmittance, UV power, and turbidity.

ii. The Discharger shall operate the treatment system to insure that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, and 5 NTU more than 5% of the time within a 24-hour period, and 10 NTU, at any time.

iii. The UV transmittance (at 254 nanometers) in the wastewater exiting the UV disinfection system shall not fall below 55 percent of maximum at any time.

iv. The quartz 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.

v. The lamp sleeves must be cleaned periodically as necessary to meet the requirements.

vi. 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.

vii. The facility must be operated in accordance with an operations and maintenance program that assures adequate disinfection.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. Pretreatment Requirements.

i. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the necessary legal authorities, programs, and controls to ensure that the following incompatible wastes are not introduced to the treatment system, where incompatible wastes are:

a) Wastes which create a fire or explosion hazard in the treatment works;

b) Wastes which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case wastes with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is specially designed to accommodate such wastes;

c) Solid or viscous wastes in amounts which cause obstruction to flow in sewers, or which cause other interference with proper operation or treatment works;

d) Any waste, including oxygen demanding pollutants (BOD, *etc*.), released in such volume or strength as to cause inhibition or disruption in the treatment works, and subsequent treatment process upset and loss of treatment efficiency;

e) Heat in amounts that inhibit or disrupt biological activity in the treatment works, or that raise influent temperatures above 40°C (104°F), unless the Regional Water Board approves alternate temperature limits;

f) Petroleum oil, non-biodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause interference or pass through;

g) Pollutants which result in the presence of toxic gases, vapors, or fumes within the treatment works in a quantity that may cause acute worker health and safety problems; and:

h) Any trucked or hauled pollutants, except at points predesignated by the Discharger.

ii. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the legal authorities, programs, and controls necessary to ensure that indirect discharges do not introduce pollutants into the sewerage system that, either alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources:

a) Flow through the system to the receiving water in quantities or concentrations that cause a violation of this Order, or:

b) Inhibit or disrupt treatment processes, treatment system operations, or sludge processes, use, or disposal and either cause a violation of this Order or prevent sludge use or disposal in accordance with this Order.

b. **Sludge/Biosolids Discharge Specifications**

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, disposal, or reuse at sites (i.e., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a regional water quality control board will satisfy these specifications.

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

iii. 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 V.B. 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 V.B.

iv. The use and disposal of biosolids shall comply with existing Federal and State laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 CFR 503. If the State Water Board and the Regional Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 CFR 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 CFR 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.

c. **Biosolids Disposal Requirements**

i. The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program for biosolids disposal contained in Attachment E.

ii. 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.

iii. The Discharger is encouraged to comply with the "Manual of Good Practice for Agricultural Land Application of Biosolids" developed by the California Water Environment Association.

d. **Biosolids Storage Requirements**

i. Facilities for the storage of Class B biosolids shall be located, designed and maintained to restrict public access to biosolids.

ii. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed and maintained to prevent washout or inundation from a storm or flood with a return frequency of 100 years.

iii. Biosolids storage facilities, which contain biosolids, shall be designed and maintained to contain all storm water falling on the biosolids storage area during a rainfall year with a return frequency of 100 years.

iv. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed, maintained and operated to minimize the generation of leachate.

e. **Collection System.** On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order 2006-0003, a Statewide General WDR for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order 2006-0003 and any future revisions thereto. Order 2006-0003 requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the General WDR. By November 2, 2006**,** the Discharger was required by that Order, not incorporated by reference herein, to apply for coverage under State Water Board Order 2006-0003 for operation of its wastewater collection system.

Regardless of the coverage obtained under Order 2006-0003, the Discharger's collection system is part of the treatment system that is subject to this Order. As such, pursuant to federal regulations, the Discharger must properly operate and maintain its collection system [40 CFR section 122.41(e)], report any non-compliance [40 CFR section 122.41(l)(6) and (7)], and mitigate any discharge from the collection system in violation of this Order [40 CFR. Section 122.41(d)].

f. This permit, and the Monitoring and Reporting Program which is a part of this permit, requires that certain parameters be monitored on a continuous basis. The Discharger has established an electronic system for operator notification for continuous recording device alarms. For systems installed following permit adoption, the notification system shall be installed simultaneously.

6. Other Special Provisions

a. When flow in Deer Creek provides a stream flow-to-effluent dilution less that 20:1, wastewater shall be treated to achieve effluent limitations contained in section IV.A.1. of this Order that are consistent with Department of Public Health (DPH; formerly the Department of Health Services) reclamation criteria, CWC, Title22, Division 4, Chapter 3, (Title 22), or equivalent.

b. 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

Compliance with the effluent limitations contained in section IV of this Order will be determined as specified below:

A. **BOD and TSS Effluent Limitations**. Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD and TSS shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of 20°C BOD (5-day) and total suspended solids 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 Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations**. 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 seven days for which analyses have been completed. 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 for that parameter for that 1 day only within the reporting period.

C. **Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations.** Continuous monitoring analyzers for chlorine residual or for dechlorination agent residual in the effluent are appropriate methods for compliance determination. A positive residual dechlorination agent in the effluent indicates that chlorine is not present in the discharge, which demonstrates compliance with the effluent limitations. This type of monitoring can also be used to prove that some chlorine residual exceedances are false positives. Continuous monitoring data showing either a positive dechlorination agent residual or a chlorine residual at or below the prescribed limit are sufficient to show compliance with the total residual chlorine effluent limitations, as long as the instruments are maintained and calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

Any excursion above the 1-hour average or 4-day average total residual chlorine effluent limitations is a violation. If the Discharger conducts continuous monitoring and the Discharger can demonstrate, through data collected from a back-up monitoring system, that a chlorine spike recorded by the continuous monitor was not actually due to chlorine, then any excursion resulting from the recorded spike will not be considered an exceedance, but rather reported as a false positive.

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

E. Mass Effluent Limitations. Compliance with the mass effluent limitations will be determined during average dry weather periods only and runoff is not occurring.

F. **Priority Pollutants.** 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).

ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

Arithmetic Mean (μ), 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: Σx 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.

Best Practicable Treatment or Control (BPTC): BPTC is a requirement of State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 68-16 – "Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California" (referred to as the "Antidegradation Policy"). BPTC is the treatment or control of a discharge necessary to assure that, *"(a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained."* Pollution is defined in CWC Section 13050(l). In general, an exceedance of a water quality objective in the Basin Plan constitutes "pollution".

Bioaccumulative pollutants are 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*) 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) are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL.

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

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 include~~d~~, 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 are 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) means 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 is 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) 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 title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

Minimum Level (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 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) are those sample results less than the laboratory's MDL.

Ocean Waters are 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 are substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

Pollutant Minimization Program (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 Regional 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 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 or Regional Water Board.

Reporting Level (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 of ten. In such cases, this additional factor must be applied to the ML in the computation of the RL.

Satellite Collection System is 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 is any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Regional Water Board Basin Plan.

Standard Deviation (σ) 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;
μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and
n is the number of samples.

Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (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



Drawing Reference: 4 KM N OF PENN VALLEY U.S.G.S TOPOGRAPHIC MAP 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE *Topographic Map* *Dated 7/1/1995*	SITE LOCATION MAP NEVADA COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NUMBER 1 LAKE WILDWOOD WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT NEVADA COUNTY	N W E S

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 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, for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a permit renewal application. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a).)

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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), 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 (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Water Code, § 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 (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1));

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2));

3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3)); 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. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4).)

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 Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Regional 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 Regional Water Board. The Regional 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 under Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under Part 136 unless otherwise specified in Part 503 unless other test procedures have been specified in this Order. (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 CFR 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 Regional 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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA 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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Water Code, § 13267.)

B. Signatory and Certification Requirements

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, and/or USEPA 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 USEPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).).

3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA 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 Regional 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 Regional 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. § 122.22(l)(4).)

2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Regional 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 Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under Part 136 unless otherwise specified in Part 503, or as specified in this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 section 40 C.F.R. 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 Regional Water Board or State Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with General Order 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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8).)

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

A. The Regional 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 (POTWs)

All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Regional 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

Table of Contents

Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) E-2
I. General Monitoring Provisions E-2
II. Monitoring Locations E-2
III. Influent Monitoring Requirements E-2
A. Monitoring Location INF-001 ..... E-2
IV. Effluent Monitoring Requirements E-2
A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 ..... E-2
V. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements E-2
VI. Discharge to Emergency Storage Pond E-2
A. Monitoring Location PND-001 ..... E-2
VII. Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable E-2
VIII. Reclamation Monitoring Requirements - Not Applicable E-2
IX. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Surface Water E-2
A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 and RSW-002 ..... E-2
X. Other Monitoring Requirements E-2
A. Biosolids E-2
B. Ultraviolet Disinfection System E-2
C. Municipal Water Supply E-2
XI. Reporting Requirements E-2
A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements E-2
B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs) E-2
C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) E-2
D. Other Reports E-2

List of Tables

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations E-2
Table E-2. Influent Monitoring E-2
Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring E-2
Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series E-2
Table E-5. Discharge to Emergency Storage Pond Requirements (PND-001) E-2
Table E-6. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements E-2
Table E-7. Ultraviolet Disinfection System Monitoring Requirements E-2
Table E-8. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements E-2
Table E-9. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule E-2
Table E-10. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Progress Reports E-2

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)

The Code of Federal Regulations section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code Sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements, which implement the federal and state 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 this Regional Water Board.

B. Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the State Department of Public Health. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger, 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 must be kept in the laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Regional Water Board staff. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Regional Water Board.

C. All analyses shall be performed in a laboratory certified to perform such analyses by the California Department of Public Health. Laboratories that perform sample analyses shall be identified in all monitoring reports.

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 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.

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 (include Latitude and Longitude when available)
--	INF-001	Influent enters the headwork, 39º, 14', 02" N, 121º, 13', 11" W
001	EFF-001	Treated effluent discharge into Deer Creek 39º, 14', 00" N, 121º, 13', 22" W
--	RSW-001	Deer Creek, 70 feet upstream from point of discharge
--	RSW-002	Deer Creek, 100 feet downstream from the point of discharge
	PND-001	Emergency Storage Pond
	UVS-001	UV Disinfection System
--	BIO-001	Biosolids
--	SPL-001	Water Supply Source Water

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

1. The Discharger shall monitor influent to the facility at INF-001 as follows:

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	mgd	Meter	Continuous	[1]
BOD 5-day 20°C	mg/L, lbs/day	24-hr Flow Proportional Composite	1/week	[1]
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L, lbs/day	24-hr Flow Proportional Composite	1/week	[1]

[1] Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Board.

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

1. The Discharger shall monitor treated wastewater at 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 and Minimum Levels
Flow	mgd	Meter	Continuous	[1]
Total Residual Chlorine[2]	mg/L	Meter	Continuous	[1]
Temperature[3]	°F	Grab	1/day	[1]
pH	standard units	Grab	1/day	[1]
BOD 5-day 20°C	mg/L	24-hr Composite[4]	3/week	[1]
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite[4]	3/week	[1]
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	3/week	[1]
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)[5]	mg/L	Grab	1/week	[1]
Nitrate + Nitrite Nitrogen (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/week	[1]
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/week	[1]
Hardness (as $CaCO_3$)[6]	mg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/month	[1]
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Dibromochloromethane[7]	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Dichlorobromomethane[7]	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	Method 1631[9]
	lbs/day	Calculated[8]		
Methylmercury	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	Method 1630[9]
Carbon tetrachloride	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Diquat	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
MBAS	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Silver, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Standard Minerals[10]	mg/L	Grab	1/year	[1]
Alpha BHC, Aldrin, and Gamma BHC (lindane)[11]	µg/L	Grab	1/year	[1]
Other Priority Pollutants[12,13]	µg/L	[14]	[15]	[1]

Footnotes for Table E3

[1] Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.

[2] Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L. (see also Section VII.D., Compliance Determination). Monitoring for chlorine is in effect until the Discharger submits 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 discharge to surface waters.

[3] A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-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.

[4] 24-hour flow proportioned composite.

[5] Monitoring for ammonia shall be concurrent with acute whole effluent toxicity monitoring. See Section V.A.1. Temperature and pH shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.

[6] Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

[7] Monitoring for dibromochloromethane and dichlorobromomethane is in effect until the Discharger submits written certification that a chlorine-based disinfection system is no longer in use, chlorine byproducts are no longer present, and chlorine containing chemicals are not added to the treatment process for wastewater discharge to surface waters.

[8] The monthly average loading for mercury shall be calculated using the average monthly effluent flow volume and the monthly average mercury concentration.

[9] Unfiltered methylmercury and total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in USEPA 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 USEPA method 1630/1631 (Revision E) with a method detection limit of 0.02 ng/L for methylmercury and 0.2 ng/L for total mercury.

[10] Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

[11] Detection limits shall be equal to or less than the lowest minimum level published in Appendix 4 of the SIP.

[12] For priority pollutant constituents with effluent limitations, detection limits shall be below the effluent limitations. If the lowest minimum level (ML) published in Appendix 4 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Plan or SIP) is not below the effluent limitation, the detection limit shall be the lowest ML. For priority pollutant constituents without effluent limitations, the detection limits shall be equal to or less than the lowest ML published in Appendix 4 of the SIP.

[13] Concurrent with receiving surface water sampling.

[14] Volatile samples and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate shall be grab samples, the remainder shall be 24-hour composite samples.

[15] Priority pollutants shall be sampled quarterly only during the third year following the date of permit adoption and shall be conducted concurrently with up stream receiving water monitoring for hardness (as $CaCO_3$) and pH. The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent monitoring for priority pollutants that have already been sampled in a given quarter, as required in Table E-3.

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 semi-annual acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling.

2. *Sample Types* – For static non-renewal and static renewal testing, the samples shall be grab samples and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the

discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at the effluent 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 and its subsequent amendments or revisions. 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 7 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 shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. *Monitoring Frequency* – The Discharger shall perform semi-annual three species chronic toxicity testing.

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 the effluent monitoring location specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from the RSW-001 sampling location, as identified in the 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:

   - The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
   - The fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (larval survival and growth test); and
   - 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 and its subsequent amendments or revisions.

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* – The chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-5, below. The receiving water control shall be used as the diluent (unless the receiving water is toxic or is dry upstream of the discharge). In such cases, laboratory control water 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 VI.C.2.a.iii.)

Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series

Sample	Dilutions (%)					Controls	
	100	75	50	25	12.5	Receiving Water	Laboratory Water
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	12.5	0	0
% Receiving Water[1]	0	25	50	75	87.5	100	0
% Laboratory Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

[1] If receiving water is toxic or if Deer Creek is dry upstream of the discharge, laboratory water will be used for the dilution series as described in EPA method 821-R-02-013 Section 7.12.

C. **WET Testing Notification Requirements**. The Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board within 24-hrs 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 Regional Water Board on the schedule for semi-annual sampling described in Table E.9, and shall contain, at minimum:

   a. The results expressed in TUc, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as $100/LC_{50}$, $100/EC_{25}$, $100/IC_{25}$, and $100/IC_{50}$, 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 Reporting.** Reports for Toxicity Reduction Evaluations shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Work 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. DISCHARGE TO EMERGENCY STORAGE POND

A. Monitoring Location PND-001

1. The Discharger shall monitor plant effluent discharged to the Emergency Storage Pond as follows:

Table E-5. Discharge to Emergency Storage Pond Requirements (PND-001)

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	mgd	Meter	Daily[1]	
Freeboard	Feet	Visual	Daily	
Odors		Observation	Daily	

[1] Report total flow for each day when wastewater is discharged to the emergence storage pond.

VII. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECLAMATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS - NOT APPLICABLE

IX. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – SURFACE WATER

A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 and RSW-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor Deer Creek at RSW-001 and RSW-002 as follows:

Table E-6. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow[1]	mgd	Calculated	1/week	[2]
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/week	[2]
pH	Standard Units	Grab	1/week	[2]
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab	1/week	[2]
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/week	[2]
Turbidity	NTU	Meter	1/week	[2]
Radionuclides	pCi/L	Grab	1/year	
Floating or suspended matter	Narrative	Visual	1/week	
Discoloration	Narrative	Visual	1/week	
Bottom Deposits	Narrative	Visual	1/week	

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Aquatic Life	Narrative	Visual	1/week	
Visible films, sheens	Narrative	Visual	1/week	
Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths	Narrative	Visual	1/week	
Potential nuisance conditions	Narrative	Visual	1/week	
Foam	Narrative	Visual	1/week	

[1] At RSW-001 only.
[2] As per 40 CFR Part 136

X. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Biosolids

1. Monitoring Location BIO-001

a. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected annually at Monitoring Location BIO-001 in accordance with EPA's POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document, August 1989, and tested for priority pollutants listed in 40 CFR section 122 Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols).

b. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of **five years**. A log shall be kept of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log should be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.

c. Upon removal of sludge, the Discharger shall submit characterization of sludge quality, including sludge percent solids and quantitative results of chemical analysis for the priority pollutants listed in 40 CFR 122 Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols). Suggested methods for analysis of sludge are provided in USEPA publications titled "Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste: Physical/Chemical Methods" and "Test Methods for Organic Chemical Analysis of Municipal and Industrial Wastewater". Recommended analytical holding times for sludge samples should reflect those specified in 40 CFR 136.6.3(e). Other guidance is available in USEPA's POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document, August 1989.

B. Ultraviolet Disinfection System

1. Monitoring Location UVS-001

1. When the Ultraviolet Disinfection system is installed and becomes operational the Discharger shall monitor USV-001 as follows:

Table E-7. Ultraviolet Disinfection System Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency
Flow rate	mgd	Meter	Continuous
Turbidity[1]	NTU	Meter	Continuous
Number of UV banks in operation	Number	Meter	Continuous
UV Transmittance	Percent (%)	Meter	Continuous
UV Power Setting	Percent (%)	Meter	Continuous
UV Dose[2]	MW-sec/cm^2	Calculated	Continuous

[1] Report daily average turbidity and maximum. If the influent exceeds 10 NTU, collect a sample for total coliform and report the duration of the turbidity exceedance.

[2] Report daily minimum UV dose, daily average UV dose, and weekly average UV dose. For the daily minimum UV dose, also report associated number of banks, gallons per minute per lamp, power settings, and UV transmittance used in the calculation. If effluent discharge has received less than the minimum UV dose and is not diverted from discharging to Deer Creek, report the duration and dose calculation variables associated with each incident.

C. Municipal Water Supply

1. Monitoring Location SPL-001

The Discharger shall monitor the Municipal Water Supply at SPL-001 as follows. A sampling station shall be established where a representative sample of the municipal water supply can be obtained. Municipal water supply samples shall be collected at approximately the same time as effluent samples.

Table E-8. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/year	
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C[1]	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/year	
Standard Minerals[2]	mg/L	Grab	1/year	[2]

[1] If the water supply is from more than one source, the EC shall be reported as a weighted average and include copies of supporting calculations.

[2] Standard minerals shall include all major cations and anions and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

XI. 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 Regional 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. **Compliance Time Schedules.** For compliance time schedules included in the Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board, on or before each compliance due date, the specified document or a written report detailing compliance or noncompliance with the specific date and task. If noncompliance is reported, the Discharger shall state the reasons for noncompliance and include an estimate of the date when the Discharger will be in compliance. The Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.

4. The Discharger shall report to the Regional 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.

5. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable Reporting Level (RL) and the current Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 CFR Part 136 for priority pollutant constituent list RLs and MDLs do not need to be reported on USEPA form 3320-1.

   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 as well as the words "Estimated Concentration" (may be shortened to "Est. Conc."). 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 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.

6. **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.

B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

1. At any time during the term of this permit, the State or Regional Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html). Until such notification is given, the Discharger shall submit hard copy SMRs. The CIWQS Web site will provide additional directions for SMR submittal in the event there will be service interruption for electronic submittal.

2. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board as specified in Table E-9.

3. In reporting the monitoring data, the Discharger shall arrange the data in tabular form so that the date, the constituents, and the concentrations are readily discernible. The data shall be summarized in such a manner to illustrate clearly whether the discharge complies with waste discharge requirements. The highest daily maximum for the month, monthly and weekly averages, and medians, and removal efficiencies (%) for BOD and Total Suspended Solids, shall be determined and recorded as needed to demonstrate compliance.

4. With the exception of flow, all constituents monitored on a continuous basis (metered), shall be reported as daily maximums, daily minimums, and daily averages; flow shall be reported as the total volume discharged per day for each day of discharge.

5. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant at the locations designated herein more frequently than is required by this Order, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the values required in the discharge monitoring report form. Such increased frequency shall be indicated on the discharge monitoring report form.

6. A letter transmitting the self-monitoring reports shall accompany each report. Such a letter shall include a discussion of requirement violations found during the reporting period, and actions taken or planned for correcting noted violations, such as operation or facility modifications. If the Discharger has previously submitted a report describing corrective actions and/or a time schedule for implementing the corrective actions, reference to the previous correspondence will be satisfactory. The transmittal letter shall contain the penalty of perjury statement by the Discharger, or the Discharger's authorized agent, as described in the Standard Provisions.

7. SMRs must be submitted to the Regional Water Board, signed and certified as required by the Standard Provisions (Attachment D), to the address listed below:

   Regional Water Quality Control Board
   Central Valley Region
   11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200
   Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114

8. 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**	**First day of second calendar month following month of sampling**
Daily	**Permit effective date**	**(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.**	**First day of second calendar month following month of sampling**
Weekly	**Sunday following permit effective date or on permit effective date if on a Sunday**	**Sunday through Saturday**	**First day of second calendar month following month of sampling**
Monthly	**First day of calendar month following permit effective date or on permit effective date if that date is first day of the month**	**1st day of calendar month through last day of calendar month**	**First day of second calendar month following month of sampling**
Quarterly	**Closest of January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1 following (or on) permit effective date**	**January 1 through March 31 April 1 through June 30 July 1 through September 30 October 1 through December 31**	**45 days from the end of the monitoring period**
Semiannually	**Closest of 1 January or 1 July following permit effective date**	**1 January through 31 December**	**45 days from the end of the monitoring period**
Annually	**January 1 following (or on) permit effective date**	**January 1 through December 31**	**45 days from the end of the monitoring period**

C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs)

1. As described in Section X.B.1 above, at any time during the term of this permit, the State or Regional Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit SMRs that will satisfy federal requirements for submittal of Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs). Until such notification is given, the Discharger shall submit DMRs in accordance with the requirements described below.

2. DMRs must be signed and certified as required by the standard provisions (Attachment D). The Discharger shall submit the original DMR and one copy of the DMR to the address listed below:

Standard Mail	**FedEx/UPS/ Other Private Carriers**
State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center PO Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-1000	State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center 1001 I Street, 15th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814

3. All discharge monitoring results must be reported on the official USEPA pre-printed DMR forms (EPA Form 3320-1). Forms that are self-generated cannot be accepted unless they follow the exact same format as EPA form 3320-1.

D. Other Reports

1. **Progress Reports.** As specified in the compliance time schedules required in Special Provisions VI, progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the following reporting requirements. At minimum, the progress reports shall include a discussion of the status of final compliance, whether the Discharger is on schedule to meet the final compliance date, and the remaining tasks to meet the final compliance date.

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

Special Provision	**Reporting Requirements**
Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan	**9 Months**, after date of permit adoption
Reuse of Municipal Wastewater Reuse Study	**12 Months**, after date of permit adoption
Receiving Water Temperature Study	Submit as part of the Report of Waste Discharge for Renewal

2. Within **60 days** of permit adoption, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining minimum levels, method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval, with a goal to achieve detection levels below applicable water quality criteria. At a minimum, the Discharger shall comply with the monitoring requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in Section 2.3 and 2.4 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California*, adopted 2 March 2000 by the State Water Resources Control Board.

3. The Discharger's sanitary sewer system collects wastewater using sewers, pipes, pumps, and/or other conveyance systems and directs the raw sewage to the wastewater treatment plant. A "sanitary sewer overflow" is defined as a discharge to ground or surface water from the sanitary sewer system at any point upstream of the wastewater treatment plant. Sanitary sewer overflows are prohibited by this Order. All violations must be reported as required in Standard Provisions. Facilities (such

as wet wells, regulated impoundments, tanks, highlines, *etc*.) may be part of a sanitary sewer system and discharges to these facilities are not considered sanitary sewer overflows, provided that the waste is fully contained within these temporary storage facilities.

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 Regional 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

Table of Contents

Attachment F – Fact Sheet F-2
I. Permit Information F-2
II. Facility Description F-2
A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls F-2
B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters F-2
C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data F-2
D. Compliance Summary F-2
E. Planned Changes F-2
III. Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations F-2
A. Legal Authority F-2
B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) F-2
C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans F-2
D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List F-2
E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations F-2
IV. Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications F-2
A. Discharge Prohibitions F-2
B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations F-2
1. Scope and Authority F-2
2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations F-2
C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) F-2
1. Scope and Authority F-2
2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives F-2
3. Determining the Need for WQBELs F-2
4. WQBEL Calculations F-2
5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) F-2
D. Final Effluent Limitations F-2
1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations F-2
2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations F-2
3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements. F-2
4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy F-2
E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not applicable F-2
F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable F-2
G. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable F-2
V. Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations F-2
A. Surface Water F-2
B. Groundwater F-2
VI. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements F-2
A. Influent Monitoring F-2
B. Effluent Monitoring F-2
C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements F-2
D. Receiving Water Monitoring F-2
1. Surface Water F-2
2. Groundwater – Not Applicable F-2

E. Other Monitoring Requirements F-2
VII. Rationale for Provisions F-2
A. Standard Provisions F-2
B. Special Provisions F-2
1. Reopener Provisions F-2
2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements F-2
3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention F-2
4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications F-2
5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) F-2
6. Other Special Provisions F-2
7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable F-2
VIII. Public Participation F-2
A. Notification of Interested Parties F-2
B. Written Comments F-2
C. Public Hearing F-2
D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions F-2
E. Information and Copying F-2
F. Register of Interested Persons F-2
G. Additional Information F-2

List of Tables

Table F-1. Facility Information F-2
Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data F-2
Table F-3. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations F-2
Table F-4. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives F-2
Table F-5. WQBEL Calculations for Ammonia F-2
Table F-6. WQBEL Calculations for Dibromochloromethane F-2
Table F-7. WQBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane F-2
Table F-8. Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations F-2
Table F-9. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations F-2

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in section II 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

WDID	5A290104001
Discharger	Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1
Name of Facility	Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	12622 Pleasant Valley Road Penn Valley, CA 95946 Nevada County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	Chad McBride, Plant Operator, (530) 432-3767
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	Mark Miller, Director of Sanitation, (530) 265-1351
Mailing Address	950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, CA 95969
Billing Address	Same
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
Major or Minor Facility	Major
Threat to Water Quality	2
Complexity	B
Pretreatment Program	N
Reclamation Requirements	N/A
Facility Permitted Flow	1.12 million gallons per day (mgd) Average Dry Weather Flow
Facility Design Flow	1.12 million gallons per day (mgd) Average Dry Weather Flow 2.40 million gallons per day (mgd) Peak Month Wet Weather Flow
Watershed	Englebright Dam to Feather River Hydrologic Area (515.3) within the Sacramento Hydrologic Basin
Receiving Water	Deer Creek
Receiving Water Type	Inland Surface Water

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

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 and a tributary to the Yuba River, and is currently regulated by Order No. R5-2002-0093, which was adopted on 7 June 2002 and expired on 7 June 2007. The terms and conditions of the current Order have been automatically continued and remain in effect until new Waste Discharge Requirements and NPDES permit are adopted pursuant to this Order.

C. The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge and submitted an application for renewal of its Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit on 19 December 2006. Supplemental information was requested on 10 October 2007 and received on 12 October 2007. A site visit was conducted on 10 October 2007, to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and conditions.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the community of Lake Wildwood and Wildwood Estates Subdivisions and serves a population of approximately 7000. The wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) design average dry weather flow capacity is 1.12 mgd.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls

The treatment system at the Facility consists of preliminary screening, equalization basin, secondary treatment with anoxic basins, pre-aeration basins, oxidation ditches, clarification, mixed media filtration, disinfection with chlorine gas, and dechlorination with sulfur dioxide prior to discharge in Deer Creek. Solid handling processes include sludge thickening followed by centrifuge dewatering.

The process flow diagram for WWTP is shown in Attachment C. Raw wastewater enters the plant headwork and is mechanically screened by an auger-type fine screen to remove coarse solids, such as rags and other objects that could damage downstream equipment or interfere with treatment. The mechanical fine screen was installed in 2001 and has sufficient capacity to handle peak hourly flows (2.4 mgd). When the mechanical screen needs to be taken out of service for maintenance, backup screening is provided by a manually cleaned bar screen. Flow is measured with a Parshall flume and then diverted to the equalization basin by gravity in a 16-inch sewer.

Wastewater from the equalization basin is pumped into the oxidation ditch flow splitter box and directed to anoxic basins where nitrate contained in return sludge and mixture of wastewater and microorganisms is reduced to nitrite and then converted to nitrogen gas and released to the atmosphere. Wastewater from the anoxic basin is aerated before going to the oxidation ditches.

The WWTP has two oxidation ditches equipped with two mechanical brush aerators in each ditch. The oxidation ditches provide extended aeration to activated sludge secondary treatment. In the oxidation ditches, biologically degradable organics are metabolized by microorganisms in the presence of oxygen to synthesize more microorganisms. Microbial metabolism and synthesis removes soluble BOD from the wastewater. The brush aerators provide oxygen to the wastewater and keep the ditch contents thoroughly mixed so that the microorganisms do not settle to the bottom of the ditch.

From the oxidation ditches, this mixture of wastewater and microorganisms, termed “mixed liquor” flows to two secondary clarifiers for final settling. Normally, wastewater flows from Oxidation Ditch No. 1 to Clarifier No. 1 and from Oxidation Ditch No. 2 to Clarifier No. 2. A cross connection exists prior to the clarifiers, allowing flow from both oxidation ditches to go to only one clarifier. A portion of the settled solids is pumped back to the headwork to maintain a high concentration of metabolically active microorganisms in the oxidation ditches. The settled solids that are returned to the oxidation ditches (via the headwork) are termed return activated sludge (RAS). Each clarifier has a dedicated pump, which typically pumps RAS at 30 to 70 percent of the average influent flows. The remainder of the settled microbial mass that is not returned to the oxidation ditches, termed waste activated sludge (WAS), is wasted to the sludge treatment facilities along with floating scum material that is scraped off the top of the clarifiers. The plant has periodically experience poorly settling sludge causing elevated solids within the secondary effluent. However, current secondary process operation (two ditches in service, longer sludge ages, sequencing of aerators) has improved clarifier performance.

Effluent from the clarifiers flows to the filter influent sump and is pumped to four parallel mixed media filters. The pressure filters consisting of 30-inches, total, of anthracite coal over smaller silica sand media, over even smaller garnet sand media, all supported on a bed of silica gravel. The filters remove most of the particulate solids that can escape from the clarifiers, reducing the suspended solids content in the effluent. The filters were designed to treat flows up to 1.12 mgd when one of the filters is offline. Higher flows (in excess of the filter influent pumps) are bypassed around the filters directly to disinfection.

Filter effluent is disinfected with gaseous chlorine and dechlorinated with sulfur dioxide. The chlorine contact basin provides 35 minutes of contact time at the peak hour flow of 2.4 mgd. After disinfection and dechlorination, the treated effluent is discharged to Deer Creek.

Scum and WAS from the clarifiers are pumped to the aerated sludge storage basin and thickener. This basin originally was the aerobic package plant for the WWTP prior to the need for the much larger oxidation ditches. The sludge storage basin/thickener stores, aerates, and thickens the sludge to 0.25 to 2 percent solids. From the thickener, sludge is pumped to a centrifuge for dewatering. The centrifuge dewaters the sludge to approximately 20 percent solids. The dewatered sludge is conveyed to a storage bin for eventual off-site disposal.

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, a water of the United States [and a tributary to Yuba River, Englebright Dam to Feather River Hydrologic Area (515.3) within the Sacramento Hydrologic Basin] at a point latitude 39º, 14', 00" N and longitude 121º, 13', 22" W.

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

Effluent limitations contained in the existing Order for discharges from Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data prior to plant upgrades from the term of the previous Order are as follows:

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data From January 2004 – To May 2006		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly	Highest Average Weekly	Maximum Daily
BOD	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	9.4
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	0.01	0.02	--	--	0.01
Settleable Solids	ml/L	0.1	--	0.2	0.05	--	0.05
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	11
Ammonia	mg/L	Temp/pH Dependent Floating Limit		pH Dependent Floating Limit			1.0
Nitrite	mg/L	1	--	--	0.5	--	--
Nitrate+Nitrite	mg/L	10	--	--	23	--	--
Total Coliform	MPN/100 ml	2.2	--	--	24	--	--
Turbidity	NTU	3	--	10	--	--	58

In addition to the above, the effluent shall not exceed the following limitations from 1 June 2006 forward:

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (From June 2006 – August 2007)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly	Highest Average Weekly	Maximum Daily
BOD	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	6.5
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	0.01	0.02	--	--	0.01
Settleable Solids	ml/L	0.1	--	0.2	0.05	--	0.05
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	10
Nitrite	mg/L	1	--	--	0.2	--	--
Nitrate+Nitrite	mg/L	10	--	--	27.1	--	--
Total Coliform	MPN/100 ml	--	2.2	23	--	--	500
Turbidity	NTU	2	--	5	--	--	22.8

D. Compliance Summary

1. The Discharger's monthly monitoring data, partially summarized in Table F-2 above, showed that the discharger had difficulty complying with effluent limitations for turbidity, total coliform, pH, , nitrate, and temperature. The Discharger has completed plant upgrades and some treatment components have been operating for over 1 year. Monitoring data for the first year of operation indicates the upgrades have resulted in compliance with effluent limitations.

E. Planned Changes

The Discharger is proposing to replace the existing chlorine disinfection system with a UV disinfection system. Provisions have been included in this Order for operation of a UV disinfection system when it becomes operational. Elimination of chlorine should eliminate the formation of chlorine byproducts chloroform, dibromochloromethane, and dichlorobromomethane. On 1 August 2008 the Discharger submitted a Revised Infeasibility Report, which included a proposed time schedule for constructing and the proposed UV disinfection facilities. The schedule for compliance is included in a Time Schedule Order proposed for adoption concurrent with this Order.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the applicable plans, policies, and regulations identified in section II of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements

(Findings). This section provides supplemental information, where appropriate, for the plans, policies, and regulations relevant to the discharge.

A. Legal Authority

See Limitations and Discharge Requirements - Findings, Section II.C.

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

See Limitations and Discharge Requirements - Findings, Section II.E.

C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans

1. **Water Quality Control Plans**. The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised October 2007), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (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. In addition, State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63 requires that, with certain exceptions, the Regional Water Board assign the municipal and domestic supply use to water bodies that do not have beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. The beneficial uses of the Deer Creek downstream of the discharge are agricultural irrigation, agricultural stock watering, hydropower generation, water contact recreation, other non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater aquatic habitat, cold freshwater aquatic habitat, warm fish migration habitat, cold fish migration habitat, warm spawning habitat, and wildlife habitat.

   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 CFR 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 CFR 131.3(e), defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after November 28, 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 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.

This Order contains Effluent Limitations requiring a tertiary level of treatment, or equivalent, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC section 13241 at the time of adoption of the previous Order No. 2002-0093 which initially established tertiary level effluent limitations for protection of beneficial of the receiving water, as discussed in more detail in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F, Section IV.

2. **Antidegradation Policy.** 40 CFR 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 No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section IV.D.4.) the discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.

3. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 CFR 122.44(l) prohibit 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. Compliance with the anti-backsliding requirements is discussed in Section IV.D.3.

4. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act**. Section 13263.6(a), California 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) (EPCRKA) 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 Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (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 CWC 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.

5. **Stormwater Requirements.** USEPA promulgated Federal Regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. The facility average dry weather flow capacity is greater than 1 MGD, therefore the facility is subject to the General ISW permit.

6. **Endangered Species Act.** 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 sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. sections 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.

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

1. Under Section 303(d) of the 1972 Clean Water Act, 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 30 November 2006 USEPA gave final approval to California's 2002 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 CFR 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.*" Deer Creek below the discharge is not listed as a WQLS in the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies, however the Feather River and Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta waters are listed for mercury.

2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads.** The USEPA requires the Regional Water Board to develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. No TMDLs are scheduled for Deer Creek (Nevada County) or the Yuba River.

E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations

1. 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 discharges are consistent with and have no potential to cause groundwater to exceed 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 Clean Water Act (CWA) and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The Federal 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 CFR, § 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 CFR 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 CFR, §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 discharges 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: 40 CFR §122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards, and 40 CFR §122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations 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 Regional Water Board's Basin Plan, page IV-17.00, contains an implementation policy ("Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives" that specifies that the Regional 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 CFR §122.44(d)(1). With respect to narrative objectives, the Regional Water Board must establish effluent limitations using one or more of three specified sources, including (1) 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 Regional Water Board's "Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives")(40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) (vi) (A), (B) or (C)), or (3) an indicator parameter. The Basin Plan contains a narrative objective requiring that: "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life*" (narrative toxicity objective). The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that surface water and groundwater do not contain chemical constituents, discoloration, toxic substances, radionuclides, or taste and odor producing substances that adversely affect beneficial uses. 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 Basin Plan also limits chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect surface water beneficial uses. For waters designated as municipal, the Basin Plan specifies that, at a minimum, waters shall not contain concentrations of constituents that exceed Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) of CCR Title 22. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 22.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

Regulations promulgated in 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 POTWs [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 USEPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, USEPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 CFR 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_5), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

a. **BOD_5 and TSS.** Federal Regulations, 40 CFR, Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD_5 and TSS. Tertiary treatment is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream and the final effluent limitations for BOD_5 and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process. BOD_5 is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The secondary and tertiary treatment standards for BOD_5 and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the treatment processes. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD_5 and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. In applying 40 CFR Part 133 for weekly and monthly average BOD_5 and TSS limitations, the application of tertiary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD_5 and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed; the 30-day average BOD_5 and TSS limitations have been revised to 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of a tertiary system. In addition to the average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations, a daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD_5 and TSS is included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. See Table F-3 for final technology-based effluent limitations required by this Order. In addition, 40 CFR 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. If 85 percent removal of BOD_5 and TSS must be achieved by a secondary treatment plant, it must also be achieved by a tertiary (i.e., treatment beyond secondary level) treatment plant. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD_5 and TSS over each calendar month.

Final discharge limitations in this Order are based on the technical capability of tertiary wastewater treatment systems. Technology-based limitations are utilized to assure the treatment systems are properly designed and operated. Discharge limitations have been established for tertiary treatment or equivalent as 10 mg/L (monthly average), 15 mg/L (weekly average) and 30 mg/L (daily maximum) for

both BOD and TSS when dilution is less than 20 to 1, receiving water flow to effluent flow.

b. Flow. The Lake Wildwood WTTP was designed to provide a tertiary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 1.12 mgd. Therefore, this Order contains an Average Dry Weather Flow effluent limit of 1.12 mgd.

c. pH Federal Regulations, 40 CFR Part 133, also establish technology-based effluent limitations for pH. The secondary treatment standards require the pH of the effluent to be no lower that 6.0 and no greater than 9.0 standard units. This Order contains an effluent pH limitation of 6.5 to 8.0 to assure compliance with receiving water objectives.

Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point 001

Table F-3. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations			
		Monthly Average	Weekly Average	Daily Maximum	Daily Average
Average Dry Weather Flow	mgd	--	--		1.12
BOD, 5-day @ 20°C	mg/L	10	15	30	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	140	280	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	140	280	--

[1] Based upon an average dry weather flow of 1.12 mgd.

Percent Removal: The average monthly percent removal of BOD 5-day 20°C and total suspended solids shall not be less than 85 percent.

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

As specified in 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include WQBELs for pollutants (including toxicity) that are or may be discharged at levels that cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above any state water quality standard. The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses 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

a. Receiving Water. The Discharger discharges to Deer Creek, a tributary to Yuba River, Englebright Dam to Feather River Hydrologic Area (515.3) within the Sacramento Hydrologic Basin. Refer to Attachment F, Section III.

b. **Hardness.** While no effluent limitation for hardness is necessary in this Order, hardness is critical to the assessment of the need for, and the development of, effluent limitations for certain metals. 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 hardness-dependent metals include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc. The equation describing the general formulation of the criteria is as follows

CTR Criterion (expressed as dissolved) = WER x CF x $e^{m[\ln(H)]+b}$ (Equation 1)

Where:

WER = water-effect ratio (default of 1.0 used in this Order)

CF = total to dissolved conversion factor

m = criterion-specific constant

H = Hardness

b = criterion-specific constant

The constants “m” and “b” are specific to both the metal under consideration, and the type of criterion (i.e., acute or chronic)

Effluent limitations for the discharge must be set to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water for all discharge conditions. In the absence of the option of including condition-dependent, “floating” effluent limitations that are reflective of actual conditions at the time of discharge, effluent limitations must be set using a reasonable worst-case condition in order to protect beneficial uses for all discharge conditions. Recent studies indicate that using the receiving water lowest hardness for establishing water quality criteria is not the most protective for the receiving water. The Regional Water Board has evaluated these studies and concurs that for some parameters the beneficial uses of the receiving water are best protected using the lowest hardness value of the effluent, while for some parameters, the use of both the lowest hardness value of the receiving water and the lowest hardness value of the effluent is the most protective, provided sufficient hardness data for the effluent and receiving water are available.

Because of the non-linearity of the Criterion equation, the relationship can be either concave downward or concave upward depending on the criterion-specific

constants. For those contaminants whereby the regulatory criteria exhibit a concave downward relationship as a function of hardness (e.g., acute and chronic copper, chromium III, nickel, and zinc, and chronic cadmium), use of the lowest recorded effluent hardness for establishment of water quality objectives is fully protective of all beneficial uses regardless of whether the effluent or receiving water hardness is higher. For purposes of establishing water quality-based effluent limitations, water quality criteria for acute and chronic copper, acute and chronic chromium III, acute and chronic nickel, acute and chronic zinc, and chronic cadmium were developed using the lowest effluent hardness value 107 mg/L. Water quality criteria for acute cadmium, acute and chronic lead, and acute silver were developed using the lowest receiving water hardness value 48 mg/L and the lowest effluent hardness 107 mg/L.

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.

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

a. CWA section 301 (b)(1) requires NPDES permits to include effluent limitations that achieve technology-based standards and any more stringent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. Water quality standards include Regional Water Board Basin Plan beneficial uses and narrative and numeric water quality objectives, State Water Board-adopted standards, and federal standards, including the CTR and NTR. The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, 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.) With regards to the narrative chemical constituents objective, the Basin Plan states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At 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 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.*"

b. Federal regulations require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numerical water quality standard. Based on information submitted as part of the application, in studies, and as directed by monitoring and reporting programs, the Regional 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 dibromochloromethane and dichlorobromomethane. Water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) for these constituents are included in this Order. A detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

c. The Regional Water Board conducted the RPA in accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP. Although the SIP applies directly to the control of CTR priority pollutants, the State Water Board has held that the Regional Water Board may use the SIP as guidance for water quality-based toxics control. The SIP states in the introduction "*The goal of this Policy is to establish a standardized approach for permitting discharges of toxic pollutants to non-ocean surface waters in a manner that promotes statewide consistency."* Therefore, in this Order the RPA procedures from the SIP were used to evaluate reasonable potential for both CTR and non-CTR constituents.

d. WQBELs were calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP, as described in Attachment F, Section IV.C.4.

e. **Ammonia.** Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia. 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 would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Applying 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(B), it is appropriate to use USEPA's Ambient National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life for ammonia, which was developed to be protective of aquatic organisms

USEPA's *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life*, for total ammonia, 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 previous Order contained "floating" effluent limitations for ammonia. This Order contains effluent limitations for ammonia to assure the treatment process adequately nitrifies the waste stream to protect the aquatic life beneficial uses.

Effluent limitations for ammonia in this Order are fixed year-round limitations that are based on reasonable worst-case conditions.

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.0. (The Discharger requested the maximum pH in the effluent be restricted to 8.0.) The Discharger's request is more restrictive than the Basin Plan objectives for pH. The Basin Plan objective for pH in the receiving stream is 6.5 to 8.5. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an aquatic organism, the pH of 8.0 was used to determine the CMC for ammonia as 5.62 mg N/L as a 1-hour average.

Because Deer Creek is sometimes dominated by the effluent, effluent temperature and pH data from the Discharger's monthly monitoring reports between October 2004 and June 2008 were used to develop the chronic criteria. The CCC for ammonia varies with pH and temperature. Using effluent data from 1 October 2004 through 30 June 2008, the CCC was calculated for each day when temperature and pH were measured. The lowest 99.9% 30-day average CCC was 2.75 mg N/L during this period. The USEPA recommended maximum 4-day average concentration is 2.5 times the 30-day average CCC or 6.88 mg N/L as a 4-day average.

The Regional Water Board calculates WQBELs 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, USEPA 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 chronic criterion. 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 chronic criterion was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period. The lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day average, and 30-day chronic criteria is then selected for deriving the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and the maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL). The remainder of the WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures. The ammonia effluent limitations are 2.3 mg/L (as N) as the AMEL and 5.6 mg/L (as N) as the MDEL. (See Section IV.C.4, Table F-5, of the Fact Sheet for calculations of the AMEL and MDEL for ammonia.)

The MEC for ammonia was 1.0 mg N/L based on 429 samples collected between 1 October 2004 and 31 July 2007 (before the treatment plant upgrades). The MEC for ammonia since the new upgrades to the treatment facility were completed was 0.9 mg N/L based on 139 samples collected between 1 August 2007 and 30 June 2008. The remaining 138 samples collected since the new upgrades had a concentration of 0.6 mg N/L or less. The maximum 30-day average ammonia concentration since the new upgrades was 0.3 mg N/L. Based on the effluent sample results it appears the Discharger is able to comply with the effluent limitations for ammonia. Weekly monitoring of ammonia is required in this Order.

f. **Carbon Tetrachloride.** The State Primary MCL for carbon tetrachloride is 0.5 µg/L. The CTR criterion for human health protection for consumption of water and aquatic organisms is 0.25 µg/L.

Carbon tetrachloride was detected in the effluent in one sample out of a total of seven samples. In the one sample collected in July 2003, the laboratory reported a "Detected but not Quantified" (DNQ) at 0.4 µg/L. Because carbon tetrachloride was only detected in one sample and not quantified, it is uncertain whether reasonable potential exists to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion. Carbon tetrachloride was used as a soil fumigant, cleaning fluid and degreasing agent, in fire extinguishers, and spot removers. These uses are now banned and it is only used in some industrial applications, therefore carbon tetrachloride is not expected in this POTW's effluent from a residential service area. Given that carbon tetrachloride is not expected in the wastewater from the Facility, the representation of the detected sample is questionable. Quarterly monitoring has been established for carbon tetrachloride in this Order to gather additional information to determine if carbon tetrachloride is present in the effluent. 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 an appropriate effluent limitation.

g. **Chlorine Residual.** The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. The Discharger uses a sulfur dioxide process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to Deer Creek. Due to the existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

The USEPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (four-day) and acute (one-hour) aquatic life criteria to average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations based on the variability of the existing data and the expected frequency of monitoring. However, because chlorine is an acutely toxic constituent that can and will be monitored continuously, an average one-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. Average one-hour and four-day limitations for chlorine, based on these criteria, are included in this Order.

The chlorine effluent limitations in this Order are the same as the limitations in the previous NPDES permit. If compliance is maintained, the Regional Water Board does not anticipated residual chlorine impacts to benthic organisms. Based on the data reported during the term of Order No. R5-2002-0093, it appears as if the Discharger can immediately comply with these new effluent limitations chlorine residual.

As described in Section II.E above, the Discharger plans on replacing the hypochlorite disinfection system with an ultraviolet light disinfection system.

Once on-line and operational, and after the Discharger submits written certification to the Regional Water Board that it has ceased all use of chlorine-containing agents in its wastewater treatment process, the Discharger will not be required to monitor for compliance with chlorine residual.

h. **Copper.** The CTR includes a hardness-dependent standard for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. The CTR standards for metals are presented in dissolved concentrations. The USEPA default conversion factors for copper in freshwater are 0.96 for both the acute and the chronic criteria. Using the worst-case measured hardness from the receiving water (48 mg/L as $CaCO_3$) and the USEPA recommended dissolved-to-total translator, the applicable chronic criterion (maximum four-day average concentration) is 5.0 µg/L and the applicable acute criterion (maximum one-hour average concentration) is 7.0 µg/L, as total recoverable. However, based on recent studies for contaminants where criteria exhibit a concave downward relationship as a function of hardness (e.g. acute and chronic copper), use of the lowest recorded effluent hardness for establishment of water quality objectives is fully protective of all beneficial uses regardless of whether the effluent or receiving water is higher. Using the lowest recorded effluent hardness (107 mg/L as $CaCO_3$) the applicable chronic criterion is 9.9 µg/L and the applicable acute criterion is 14.9 µg/L.

   Copper was detected at concentrations ranging from 2.6 to 6.1 µg/L in the effluent in seven samples collected between May 2003 and October 2006. Using effluent hardness to establish the objectives for copper no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion exists. Quarterly monitoring has been established for hardness and copper in this Order to gather additional information to determine if copper is present in the effluent above the CTR criterion. 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 an appropriate effluent limitation.

i. **Dibromochloromethane.** The CTR includes a dibromochloromethane criterion of 0.41 µg/L for the protection of human health and is based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed. The MEC for dibromochloromethane was 1.2 µg/L, based on seven samples collected between May 2003 and October 2006. The concentration of dibromochloromethane in upstream receiving water was not available. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for dibromochloromethane. An AMEL and MDEL for dibromochloromethane of 0.41 µg/L and 0.82 µg/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health (see Attachment F, Table F-6 for WQBEL calculations).

   The sample results for the effluent indicate that the Discharger will not be able to meet the new limitations. The Discharger has indicated in a Revised Infeasibility Report submitted 1 August 2008 that additional time will be required to comply

with the final effluent limits for dibromochloromethane. The Discharger anticipates that the addition of ultraviolet disinfection and eliminating chlorine will be necessary in order to comply with the effluent limitations, and the new or modified control measures cannot be designed, installed, and put into operation within a reasonable period of time. Furthermore, the effluent limitations for dibromochloromethane are a new regulatory requirement within this permit which become effective upon the effective date of this Order. Therefore, a compliance time schedule order for compliance with dibromochloromethane effluent limitations is established in TSO No. R5-2009-XXXX in accordance with CWC sections 13000 and 13385. Order No. R5-2009- XXXX also includes interim effluent limitations.

j. **Dichlorobromomethane.** The CTR includes a dichlorobromomethane criterion of 0.56 µg/L for the protection of human health and is based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed. The MEC for dichlorobromomethane ranged from 2.1 to 14.6 µg/L, in seven samples collected between May 2003 and October 2006. The concentration of dichlorobromomethane in upstream receiving water was not available. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for dichlorobromomethane.

An AMEL and MDEL for dichlorobromomethane of 0.56 µg/L and 1.12 µg/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health (see Attachment F, Table F-7 for WQBEL calculations).

The sample results for the effluent indicate that the Discharger will not be able to meet the new limitations. The Discharger has indicated in a Revised Infeasibility Report submitted 1 August 2008 that additional time will be required to comply with the final effluent limits for dichlorobromomethane. The Discharger anticipates that the addition of ultraviolet disinfection and eliminating chlorine will be necessary in order to comply with the effluent limitations, and the new or modified control measures cannot be designed, installed, and put into operation within a reasonable period of time. Furthermore, the effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane are a new regulatory requirement within this permit which become effective upon the effective date of this Order. Therefore, a compliance time schedule order for compliance with dichlorobromomethane effluent limitations is established in TSO No. R5-2009-XXXX in accordance with CWC sections 13000 and 13385. Order No. R5-2009- XXXX also includes interim effluent limitations.

k. **Diquat.** USEPA's Ambient Water Quality Criteria for freshwater aquatic life protection (instantaneous maximum standard) for diquat is 0.5 µg/L. Diquat was detected at 15 µg/L, in one of seven samples collected between May 2003 and October 2006. The treatment facility effluent is primarily domestic wastewater and the high value reported for a chemical that is used as an aquatic herbicide is questionable. Because diquat was only detected in one sample, it is uncertain

whether collection and procedures were adequate and whether reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the ambient water quality criterion exists. Quarterly monitoring has been established for diquat in this Order to gather additional information to determine if diquat is present in the effluent. 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 an appropriate effluent limitation.

l. **Mercury.** The current USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria 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 one-in-a-million cancer risk) 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 CFR Part 131, USEPA 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, USEPA reserved the mercury criteria for freshwater and aquatic life and may adopt new criteria at a later date.

The maximum observed effluent mercury concentration was 0.0074 µg/L, which is below the aquatic life and human health criteria. However, the Lower Feather River and the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta have been listed as impaired pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act because of mercury. Mercury bioaccumulates in fish tissue and, therefore, discharge of mercury to the receiving water is likely to contribute to exceedances of the narrative toxicity objective and impacts on beneficial uses.

Because the receiving water is tributary to the Feather River, the discharge must not cause or contribute to increased mercury levels. This Order contains a performance-based mass effluent limitation of 0.0021 lbs/month for mercury. This limitation is intended to maintain the mercury loading at the current level until a total maximum daily load (TMDL) can be established and USEPA develops mercury standards that are protective of human health. The mass limitation was derived using the maximum observed effluent mercury concentration and the reported average daily effluent flow rate. Compliance time schedules have not been included in this Order. If USEPA develops new water quality standards for mercury, this permit may be reopened and the Effluent Limitations modified, as necessary.

m. **Methylene blue active substances (MBAS).** The Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL)-Consumer Acceptance Limit for foaming agents (MBAS) is 500 µg/L. MBAS was detected at 540 µg/L in one of seven samples collected between May 2003 and October 2006. Because MBAS was only detected in only one sample, it is uncertain whether reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the secondary MCL exists. Quarterly monitoring has been established for MBAS in this Order to gather

additional information to determine if MBAS is present in the effluent. 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 an appropriate effluent limitation.

n. **Nitrite and Nitrate.** Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia. 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. Nitrate and nitrite are known to cause adverse health effects in humans. The California DHS has adopted Primary MCLs at Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Table 64431-A, 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. Title 22 CCR, Table 64431-A, also includes a primary MCL of 10,000 µg/L for the sum of nitrate and nitrite, measured as nitrogen.

USEPA has developed a primary MCL and an MCL goal of 1,000 µg/L for nitrite (as nitrogen). For nitrate, USEPA has developed Drinking Water Standards (10,000 µg/L as Primary Maximum Contaminant Level) and Ambient Water Quality Criteria for protection of human health (10,000 µg/L for non-cancer health effects). Recent toxicity studies have indicated a possibility that nitrate is toxic to aquatic organisms.

Inadequate or incomplete denitrification may result in the discharge of nitrate and/or nitrite to the receiving stream. The conversion of ammonia to nitrites and the conversion of nitrites to nitrates present a reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCLs for nitrite and nitrate. AMELs for nitrite and nitrate of 1 mg/L and 10 mg/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on the MCLs. 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.

The MEC for nitrate was 48.3 mg/L, based on 149 samples collected between 31 August 2004 and 31 July 2007 (before the treatment plant upgrades). The upstream receiving water nitrate concentration was not available. The MEC for nitrate since the new upgrades to the treatment facility were completed was 7.3 mg/L based on 39 samples collected between 8 August 2007 and 29 May 2008. Therefore, with the completion of the plant upgrades, it appears the Discharger will be in compliance with primary MCL for nitrate.

AMELs for nitrite and nitrate of 1.0 mg/L and 10 mg/L respectively are included in this Order based on the 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.

o. **Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides.** Alpha-BHC (alpha-hexachlorocyclohexane) was detected in one of seven samples collected between May 2003 and October 2006 at a concentration of 0.035 µg/L. However, in 14 additional samples collected between March 2007 and July 2008, alpha-BHC was not detected at the minimum acceptable reporting level as indicated in appendix 4 of the SIP. Aldrin was reported once as detected, but not quantified at 0.005 µg/L in one out of seven sampling events between May 2003 and October 2006. However, in 14 additional samples collected between March 2007 and July 2008 aldrin was not detected at the minimum acceptable reporting level as indicated in appendix 4 of the SIP. Aldrin was banned from all uses in 1987 and it is not expected to be present in the wastewater from a residential service area. Each of these constituents is a chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticide. The Basin Plan requires that no individual pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses; total chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides shall not be present in the water column at detectable concentrations; and pesticide concentrations shall not exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies. The CTR contains numeric criteria for alpha-BHC and aldrin of 0.0039 µg/L and 0.00013 µg/L respectively for freshwaters from which both water and organisms are consumed. Based on the new information it does not appear that there is reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan Objective. Annual monitoring is included in this Order for alpha-BHC and aldrin. 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 an appropriate effluent limitation.

Gamma-BHC (lindane) was detected in the effluent in four out of seven CTR sampling events between May 2003 and October 2006, with concentrations ranging from 0.012 µg/L to 0.14 µg/L. The CTR contains a numeric criterion for lindane of 0.019 µg/L. The detection of lindane in the effluent indicates a reasonable potential to exceed the Basin Plan limitations for the CTR criterion for lindane. However, in 14 additional samples collected between March 2007 and July 2008, lindane was not detected at a reported level of 0.01 µg/L. The minimum acceptable reporting level is 0.02 µg/L, as indicated in appendix 4 of the SIP. Therefore based on the new information, an effluent limitation for lindane is not included in this Order. Annual monitoring is included in this Order for lindane. 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 an appropriate effluent limitation.

p. **Pathogens**. The beneficial uses of the 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 Regional Water Board finds that the wastewater must be disinfected and

adequately treated to prevent disease. The principal infectious agents (pathogens) that may be present in raw sewage may be classified into three broad groups: bacteria, parasites, and viruses. Tertiary treatment, consisting of chemical coagulation, sedimentation, and filtration, has been found to remove approximately 99.5% of viruses. Filtration is an effective means of reducing viruses and parasites from the waste stream. The wastewater must be treated to tertiary standards (filtered), or equivalent, to protect contact recreational and food crop irrigation uses.

The California Department of Public Health (DPR) 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. As coliform organisms are living and mobile, it is impracticable to quantify an exact number of coliform organisms and to establish weekly average limitations. Instead, coliform organisms are measured as a most probable number and regulated based on a 7-day median limitation.

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 Regional Water Board finds that it is appropriate to apply an equivalent level of treatment to that required by DPH for unrestricted reuse of reclaimed water because the receiving water is used for irrigation of agricultural land and for contact recreation purposes. The stringent limitations for total coliform organisms 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. The method of treatment is not prescribed by this Order; however, wastewater must be treated to a level that consistently achieves the total coliform organism effluent limitations included in this Order.

In addition to coliform testing, turbidity is used as a second indicator of the effectiveness of the treatment process and to assure compliance with the required level of treatment. The previous Order established effluent limitations for turbidity. The tertiary treatment process, or equivalent, is capable of reliably meeting a turbidity limitation 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, allowing immediate detection of filter failure and rapid corrective action. Coliform testing, by comparison, is not conducted continuously and

requires several hours, to days, to identify high coliform concentrations. The limitations in the previous Order were solely an operational check to ensure the treatment system was functioning properly and could meet the limits for total coliform organism. The effluent limitations were not intended to regulate turbidity in the receiving water. Therefore, to ensure consistent compliance with the total coliform organism disinfection limitations included in this Order, a turbidity specification is included in this Order as an operational specification prior to disinfection. The operational specification requires that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average; 5 NTU, more than 5% of the time within a 24-hour period, and an instantaneous maximum of 10 NTU.

q. **pH.** 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. Changes in normal ambient pH levels shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh waters with designated COLD or WARM beneficial uses.*" Effluent limitations for pH are included in this Order based on the Basin Plan objectives for pH and the Discharger's request to limit the upper pH limit to 8.0.

r. **Salinity.** The discharge contains total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, sulfate, and electrical conductivity (EC). These are water quality parameters that are indicative of the salinity of the water. Their presence in water can be growth limiting to certain agricultural crops and can affect the taste of water for human consumption. The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates State MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for EC, TDS, sulfate, and chloride.

Table F-4. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Goal[1]	Secondary MCL[3]	Effluent	
			Avg	Max
EC (µmhos/cm)	Varies[2]	900, 1600, 2200	631	997
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	360	486
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	70.3	85.9
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	46.9	51.9

1 Agricultural water quality goals based on *Water Quality for Agriculture*, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985)

2 The EC level in irrigation water that harms crop production depends on the crop type, soil type, irrigation methods, rainfall, and other factors. An EC level of 700 umhos/cm is generally considered to present no risk of salinity impacts to crops. However, many crops are grown successfully with higher salinities.

3 The secondary MCLs are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.

i. **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. The recommended agricultural water quality goal for chloride, that would apply the narrative chemical constituent objective, is 106 mg/L as a long-term average based on Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985). The 106 mg/L water

quality goal is intended to protect against adverse effects on sensitive crops when irrigated via sprinklers. The average chloride concentration in the effluent was 47 mg/L with a maximum reported concentration of 52 mg/L. The effluent does not exceed the secondary MCL recommended level of 250 mg/L.

ii. **Electrical Conductivity (EC)**. The secondary MCL for EC is 900 µmhos/cm as a recommended level, 1600 µmhos/cm as an upper level, and 2200 µmhos/cm as a short-term maximum. The recommended agricultural screening value, that would apply the narrative chemical constituents objective, is 700 µmhos/cm as a long-term average based on Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985). The 700 µmhos/cm agricultural water quality goal is intended to prevent reduction in crop yield, i.e., a restriction on use of water, for salt-sensitive crops, such as beans, carrots, turnips, and strawberries. Most other crops can tolerate higher EC concentrations without harm, however, as the salinity of the irrigation water increases, more crops are potentially harmed by the EC, or extra measures must be taken by the farmer to minimize or eliminate any harmful impacts.

A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports from 31 August 2004 through 31 July 2007 shows an average effluent EC of 631 µmhos/cm, with a range from 179 µmhos/cm to 997 µmhos/cm for 159 samples. The background receiving water EC averaged 103 µmhos/cm in 152 sampling events collected by the Discharger from 31 August 2004 through 31 July 2007.

iii. **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. Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 49.4 mg/L to 87.1 mg/L, with an average of 70.3 mg/L, for seven samples collected by the Discharger from May 2003 through October 2006. The effluent does not exceed the secondary MCL recommended level of 250 mg/L.

iv. **Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)**. 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. The recommended agricultural water quality goal for TDS, that would apply the narrative chemical constituent objective, is 450 mg/L as a long-term average based on Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985). Water Quality for Agriculture evaluates the impacts of salinity levels on crop tolerance and yield reduction, and establishes water quality goals that are protective of the agricultural uses. The 450 mg/L water quality goal is intended to prevent reduction in crop yield, i.e., a restriction on use of water, for salt-sensitive crops. Only the most salt sensitive crops require irrigation water of 450 mg/L or less to prevent loss of yield. Most other crops can

tolerate higher TDS concentrations without harm, however, as the salinity of the irrigation water increases, more crops are potentially harmed by the TDS, or extra measures must be taken by the farmer to minimize or eliminate any harmful impacts.

The average TDS effluent concentration was 360 mg/L and a ranged from 75 mg/L to 486 mg/L for seven samples collected by the Discharger from 31 August 2004 through 31 July 2007.

v. **Salinity Effluent Limitations.** Based on the relatively low reported salinity, the discharge currently does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity. However, since the Discharger discharges to Deer Creek, a tributary of the Yuba River and eventually the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, of additional concern is the salt contribution to Delta waters. A maximum annual average of 683 µmhos/cm occurred during the first 9 months of 2007. This Order includes a performance-based effluent limitation of 700 µmhos/cm for EC to be applied as an annual average to limit the discharge to current levels. This performance-based effluent limitation represents the rounded-up maximum annual average effluent EC concentration for a calendar year using data from October 1994 through August 2007. Based on the sample results for the effluent, it appears the Discharger can meet these new limitations. In order to ensure that the Discharger will continue to control the discharge of salinity, this Order includes a requirement to develop and implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan. Also water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the relative contribution of salinity from the source water to the effluent.

s. **Settleable Solids.** For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states that *"[w]ater shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses."* The previous Order contained effluent limitations of 0.1 mL/L as a monthly average and 0.2 mL/L as a daily maximum. Tertiary treatment processes result in solids removal reflective of the design capabilities of the treatment system. The TSS limitations of 10 mg/L (monthly average), 15 mg/L (weekly average) and 30 mg/L (daily maximum) include suspended and settleable matter in the analysis and an analysis for settleable matter is no longer necessary. With the TSS limitations in place, the settleable solids limits can be removed as an effluent limitation.

t. **Silver.** The CTR includes a hardness-dependent standard for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for silver. The CTR standards for metals are presented in dissolved concentrations. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The conversion factor for silver in freshwater is 0.85 for the instantaneous maximum criterion. Using the worst-case measured hardness from the receiving water (48 mg/L as $CaCO_3$) and the USEPA recommended dissolved-to-total translator, the applicable acute criterion (maximum 1-hour average concentration) is 1.15 µg/L, as total recoverable (there

is no published chronic water quality criterion for silver). However, based on recent studies for contaminants where criteria exhibit a concave upward relationship as a function of hardness (e.g., acute silver), use of the lowest recorded effluent hardness and highest recorded receiving water hardness may be used for establishment of water quality objectives. Using the minimum observed hardness of the receiving water (48 mg/L) and the lowest recorded effluent hardness (107 mg/L as $CaCO_3$) the applicable acute criterion for silver is 4.56 µg/L.

Silver was detected at concentrations ranging from less than the 0.1 µg/L detection limit to 1.57 µg/L in the effluent in seven samples collected between May 2003 and October 2006. Using effluent and receiving water hardness to establish the objective for silver, no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion exists. Quarterly monitoring has been established for hardness and silver in this Order to gather additional information to determine if silver is present in the effluent above the CTR criterion. 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 an appropriate effluent limitation.

u. **Toxicity.** See Section IV.C.5. of the Fact Sheet regarding whole effluent toxicity.

4. WQBEL Calculations

a. Effluent limitations for dibromochloromethane and dichlorobromomethane were calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The following paragraphs describe the methodology used for calculating effluent limitations.

b. **Effluent Limitation Calculations.** In calculating maximum effluent limitations, the ECA is calculated as follows.

$ECA_{acute} = CMC + D(CMC-B)$ $\qquad$ $ECA_{chronic} = CCC + D(CCC-B)$

For the human health, agriculture, or other long-term criterion/objective, a dilution credit can be applied. The ECA is calculated as follows:

$ECA_{HH} = HH + D(HH - B)$

where:

ECA_{acute} = effluent concentration allowance for acute (one-hour average) toxicity criterion

$ECA_{chronic}$ = effluent concentration allowance for chronic (four-day average) toxicity criterion

ECA_{HH} = effluent concentration allowance for human health, agriculture, or other long-term criterion/objective

CMC = criteria maximum concentration (one-hour average)

CCC = criteria continuous concentration (four-day average, unless otherwise noted)

HH = human health, agriculture, or other long-term criterion/objective

D = dilution credit

B = maximum receiving water concentration

Since no dilution credit is being granted the effluent concentration allowances were set equal to the criteria/standards/objectives.

$ECA_{acute} = CMC$ $\qquad$ $ECA_{chronic} = CCC$ $\qquad$ $ECA_{HH} = HH$

Acute and chronic toxicity ECAs were then converted to equivalent long-term averages (LTA) using statistical multipliers and the lowest is used. Additional statistical multipliers were then used to calculate the maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) and the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL).

AMELs based on human health criteria are set equal to the human health ECAs and a statistical multiplier is used to calculate the MDEL.

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

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

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

where: $mult_{AMEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL
$mult_{MDEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL
M_A = statistical multiplier converting CMC to LTA
M_C = statistical multiplier converting CCC to LTA

Water quality-based effluent limitations were calculated for ammonia, dichlorobromomethane, and dibromochloromethane as follows in Tables F-5 through F-7.

Table F-5. WQBEL Calculations for Ammonia

	Acute	Chronic (4-day)	Chronic (30-day)
Criteria (mg/L) [1]	5.62	6.88	2.75
Dilution Credit	No Dilution	No Dilution	No Dilution
ECA	5.62	6.88	2.75
ECA Multiplier	0.230	0.412	0.700
LTA	1.29	2.83	1.93
AMEL Multiplier (95th%)	1.82	[2]	[3]
AMEL (mg/L)	**2.3**	[2]	[3]
MDEL Multiplier (99th%)	4.35	[2]	[3]
MDEL (mg/L)	**5.6**	[2]	[3]

[1] USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria
[2] Limitations based on acute LTA [Acute LTA < Chronic (4-day) LTA]
[3] Limitations based on acute LTA [Acute LTA < Chronic (30-day) LTA]

Table F-6. WQBEL Calculations for Dibromochloromethane

	Human Health
Criteria (mg/L)	0.41
Dilution Credit	N/A
ECA	0.41
AMEL (mg/L) [1]	**0.41**
MDEL/AMEL Multiplier[2]	2.01
MDEL (mg/L)	**0.82**

[1] AMEL = ECA per section 1.4.B, Step 6 of SIP
[2] Assumes sampling frequency n<=4. Uses MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of SIP.

Table F-7. WQBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane

	Human Health
Criteria (mg/L)	0.56
Dilution Credit	N/A
ECA	0.56
AMEL (mg/L) [1]	**0.56**
MDEL/AMEL Multiplier[2]	2.01
MDEL (mg/L)	**1.12**

[1] AMEL = ECA per section 1.4.B, Step 6 of SIP
[2] Assumes sampling frequency n<=4. Uses MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of SIP.

Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point 001

Table F-8. Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0
Ammonia	Mg/L	2.3		5.6		
Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	0.41	--	0.82	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--

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 III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, "…*effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate*…". USEPA 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.* 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 bioassays ---------- 70%
Median for any three or more 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 III-8.00) Adequate WET data is not available to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Attachment E of this Order requires quarterly semi-annual WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective.

In addition to WET monitoring, Special Provisions VI.C.2.a. requires the Discharger to submit to the Regional Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger and requirements for accelerated monitoring, as well as, requirements for TRE initiation if a pattern of toxicity is demonstrated.

D. Final Effluent Limitations

1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations

Title 40 CFR 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 CFR 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 CFR 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 MCLs) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations

Title 40 CFR 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) unless impracticable. However, for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting, the USEPA recommends the use of a maximum daily effluent limitation in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for two reasons. "*First, the basis for the 7-day average for POTWs derives from the secondary treatment requirements. This basis is not related to the need for assuring achievement of water quality standards. Second, a 7-day average, which could comprise up to seven or more daily samples, could average out peak toxic concentrations and therefore the discharge's potential for causing acute toxic effects would be missed.*" (TSD, pg. 96) This Order utilizes maximum daily effluent limitations in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for, dichlorobromomethane and dibromochloromethane as recommended by the TSD for the achievement of water quality standards and for the protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. Furthermore, for BOD, TSS, pH, chlorine residual,

coliform weekly average effluent limitations 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 Attachment F, Section IV.C.3., above.

3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.

The Clean Water Act 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 Clean Water Act sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 CFR 122.44(*l*).

The previous permit contained effluent limitations for turbidity. The prior limitations for turbidity were solely an operational check to ensure the treatment system was functioning properly and could meet the limits for solids and coliform. The prior effluent limitations were not intended to regulate turbidity in the receiving water. Rather, turbidity is an operational parameter to determine proper system functioning and not a water quality-based effluent limitation.

The revised Order contains performance based operational turbidity specifications to be met prior to disinfection in lieu of effluent limitations. The revised Order does not include effluent limitations for turbidity. However, the performance-based specification in this Order is an equivalent limit that is not less stringent, and therefore does not constitute backsliding.

The proposed revised operational specifications for turbidity are the same as the effluent limitations in the previous permit, with the inclusion of a more stringent requirement for an instantaneous maximum limit at any time. (See Special Provisions C.5. Ultraviolet Disinfection (UV) System Operating Specifications for turbidity specifications.) The proposed revised permit moves the point of compliance from the final effluent after disinfection to an internal compliance point prior to disinfection. These revisions are consistent with state regulations implementing recycled water requirements.

The previous Order contained settleable solids effluent limitations of 0.1 ml/L as a monthly average and 0.2 ml/L as a daily maximum. Tertiary treatment processes result in solids removal reflective of the design capabilities of the treatment system. The TSS limitations in this Order are more stringent than the limitations in the previous Order and compliance with TSS limitations will result in settleable solids less than the 0.1 ml/L limitation in the previous Order. Settleable solids monitoring data for the discharge has consistently been reported as less than 0.05 ml/L. The Standard Methods analysis for settleable matter cannot reliably measure below 0.1 ml/L. The TSS limitations of 10 mg/L (monthly average), 15 mg/L (weekly average) and 25 mg/L (daily maximum) include suspended and settleable matter in the analysis and an analysis for settleable matter is no longer necessary. These TSS limitations effectively limit settleable solids concentrations to less than the

previous settleable solids limitations. With the stringent TSS limitations in place the settleable solids limits can be removed as an effluent limitation.

The revision in the turbidity limitation and the removal of settleable solids is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 68-16 because this Order imposes equivalent or more stringent requirements than the prior permit and therefore does not allow degradation.

4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy

The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 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.

Summary of Final Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point 001

Table F-9. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD 5-day @ 20°C	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	140	280	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	140	280	--	--
Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	0.41	--	0.82	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	2.3		5.6		
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	1	--	--	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	9.3	--	--	--	--
Nitrite + Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	10	--	--	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	93	--	--	--	--

[1] Based on the average dry weather design flow of 1.12 mgd.

Percent Removal: The average monthly percent removal of BOD 5-day 20°C and total suspended solids shall not be less than 85 percent.

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

- 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
- 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.

Total Residual Chlorine. Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:

- 0.01 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
- 0.02 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.

The total residual chlorine effluent limitations are effective until the Discharger submits 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.

Total Coliform Organisms. Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:

- 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
- 23 MPN/100 mL, as a daily maximum.

Mass Limitation for Mercury. The monthly average total recoverable mercury loading in the effluent shall not exceed 0.0021 lbs per month.

Average Dry Weather Flow. The Average Dry Weather Flow shall not exceed 1.12 mgd.

Electrical Conductivity. The annual average electrical conductivity concentration in the effluent shall not exceed 700 µmhos/cm.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not applicable

F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

G. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

Basin Plan water quality objectives to protect the beneficial uses of surface water and groundwater include numeric objectives and narrative objectives, including objectives for chemical constituents, toxicity, and tastes and odors. The toxicity objective requires that surface water and groundwater be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in humans, plants, animals, or aquatic life. The chemical constituent objective requires that surface water and groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect any beneficial use or that exceed the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) in Title 22, CCR. The tastes and odors objective states that surface water and groundwater shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that surface water and groundwater do not contain chemical constituents, toxic

substances, radionuclides, or taste and odor producing substances in concentrations that adversely affect domestic drinking water supply, agricultural supply, or any other beneficial use.

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 Regional 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 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 biostimulatory substances, chemical constituents, color, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, salinity, sediment, settleable material, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, turbidity.

   Numeric Basin Plan objectives for bacteria, dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, and turbidity are applicable to this discharge and have been incorporated as Receiving Surface Water Limitations. Rational for these numeric receiving surface water limitations are as follows:

   a. **Bacteria.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that "*[I]n water designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml*." Numeric Receiving Water Limitations for bacteria are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

   b. **Biostimulatory Substances**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that "*[W]ater shall not contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for biostimulatory substances are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

   c. **Color**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that "*[W]ater shall be free of discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for color are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

   d. **Chemical Constituents**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]aters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for chemical constituents are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

e. **Dissolved Oxygen.** The Deer Creek has been designated as having the beneficial use of cold freshwater aquatic habitat (COLD). For water bodies designated as having COLD as a beneficial use, the Basin Plan includes a water quality objective of maintaining a minimum of 7.0 mg/L of dissolved oxygen. Since the beneficial use of COLD does apply to the Deer Creek, a receiving water limitation of 7.0 mg/L for dissolved oxygen was included in this Order.

   For surface water bodies outside of the Delta, the Basin Plan includes the water quality objective that "…*the monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration shall not fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass, and the 95 percentile concentration shall not fall below 75 percent of saturation.*" This objective was included as a receiving water limitation in this Order.

f. **Floating Material**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]ater shall not contain floating material in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for floating material are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

g. **Oil and Grease**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]aters shall not contain oils, greases, waxes, or other materials 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."* Receiving Water Limitations for oil and grease are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

h. **pH.** The Basin Plan includes water quality objective that *"[T]he pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5. Changes in normal ambient pH levels shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh waters with designated COLD or WARM beneficial uses.*" This Order includes receiving water limitations for both pH range and pH change.

   The Basin Plan allows an appropriate averaging period for pH change in the receiving stream. Since there is no technical information available that indicates that aquatic organisms are adversely affected by shifts in pH within the 6.5 to 8.5 range, an averaging period is considered appropriate and a monthly averaging period for determining compliance with the 0.5 receiving water pH limitation is included in this Order.

i. **Pesticides**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for pesticides beginning on page III-6.00. Receiving Water Limitations for pesticides are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

j. **Radioactivity**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[R]adionuclides shall not 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."* The Basin Plan states further that *"[A]t a minimum,*

waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of radionuclides in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations…" Receiving Water Limitations for radioactivity are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

k. **Sediment.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[T]he suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters shall not be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses"* Receiving Water Limitations for suspended sediments are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

l. **Settleable Material.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]aters shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for settleable material are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

m. **Suspended Material.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]aters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for suspended material are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

n. **Taste and Odors**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]ater 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."* Receiving Water Limitations for taste- or odor-producing substances are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

o. **Temperature.** The Deer Creek has the beneficial uses of both COLD and WARM. The Basin Plan includes the objective that "[a]*t no time or place shall the temperature of COLD or WARM intrastate waters be increased more than 5ºF above natural receiving water temperature*."

p. **Toxicity**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[A]ll waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life."* Receiving Water Limitations for toxicity are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

q. **Turbidity.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that "*[I]ncreases in turbidity attributable to controllable water quality factors shall not exceed the following limits:*

- *Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs), increases shall not exceed 1 NTU.*

- *Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 20 percent.*

- *Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 NTUs.*
- *Where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 percent*."

A numeric Receiving Surface Water Limitation for turbidity is included in this Order and is based on the Basin Plan objective for turbidity.

B. Groundwater

All processes are contained in concrete basins. The recent upgrades to the treatment facility included elimination of the sludge drying beds and lining the emergency storage pond. There is no potential for pollutants to migrate to groundwater in amounts that could degrade groundwater or cause groundwater to exceed applicable water quality objectives. This Order contains a limitation prohibiting degradation of groundwater.

VI. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order, establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to 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 and TSS reduction requirements).

B. Effluent Monitoring

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR 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.

2. The SIP states that if "…all reported detection limits of the pollutant in the effluent are greater than or equal to the C [water quality criterion or objective] value, the RWQCB [Regional Water Board] shall establish interim requirements…that require additional monitoring for the pollutant…" This Order contains effluent limitations for ammonia, BOD, TSS, nitrate, nitrite, chlorine residual, pH, flow, toxicity, and total coliform. In addition, reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality objectives was found for dichlorobromomethane and dibromochloromethane. Monitoring for these constituents has been included in the Order. Based on monitoring data it is uncertain whether, carbon tetrachloride, copper, diquat, MBAS, and silver are present in the effluent in concentrations that exceed applicable criteria. Quarterly monitoring has been established in this Order to gather additional information on these constituents. Based on new monitoring data submitted for aldrin, alpha-BHC, and gamma-BHC indicating these constituents were no longer present, effluent limits were not included. Annual monitoring for these pesticides has been included to gather additional information on these constituents.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Semi-annual 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.

2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Semi-annual chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required 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.

2. Groundwater – Not Applicable

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. **Biosolids Monitoring**

   Biosolids monitoring is required to ensure compliance with the biosolids disposal requirements (Special Provisions VI.C.6.a.). Biosolids disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation.

2. **Ultraviolet Disinfection System Monitoring**

UV System specifications and monitoring and reporting is required when the UV system becomes operational to ensure that adequate UV dosage is applied to the wastewater to inactivate pathogens e.g. viruses in the wastewater. UV Disinfection system monitoring is imposed pursuant to requirements established by the California Department of Public Health, (DPH) and the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) and American Water Works Association Research Foundation NWRI/AWWARF's *"Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse.*

3. **Water Supply Monitoring**

Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater.

VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 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.

Section 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) 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. Section 123.25(a)(12) allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 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. 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.

b. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR section 122.62, including:

- 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.

- When new information, that was not available at the time of permit issuance, would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.

c. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** This Order requires that the Discharger to prepare and implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the municipal wastewater treatment system. The plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board within nine (9) months of the effective date of this Order for approval by the Executive Officer. Based on a review of the results of implementation of the salinity evaluation and minimization plan this Order may be reopened for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for salinity.

d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a 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.

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 III-8.00.) The discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. This provision requires the Discharger to develop a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Work Plan in accordance with EPA guidance. In addition, the provision provides a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger and requirements for accelerated monitoring, as well as, requirements for TRE initiation if a pattern of toxicity has been demonstrated.

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 a pattern of toxicity at 100% effluent.

Accelerated Monitoring. The provision requires accelerated WET testing when a regular WET test result exceeds the monitoring trigger. The purpose of accelerated monitoring is to determine, in an expedient manner, whether there is a pattern of toxicity before requiring the implementation of a TRE. Due to possible seasonality of the toxicity, 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 every 2 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 a pattern 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.

Figure F-1
WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart



TRE Guidance. The Discharger is required to prepare a TRE Work Plan in accordance with USEPA guidance. Numerous guidance documents are available, as identified below:

- *Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants,* (EPA/833B-99/002), August 1999.
- Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial TREs, (EPA/600/2-88/070), April 1989.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures,* Second Edition, EPA 600/6-91/005F, February 1991.
- *Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I*, EPA 600/6-91/005F, May 1992.
- *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.
- *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.
- *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.
- *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.
- *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control,* EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991.

b. **Receiving Water Temperature Study:** The Discharger is required to conduct a temperature study in Deer Creek to determine adequate temperature thresholds downstream of the discharge.

c. **Reuse of Municipal Wastewater Feasibility Study:** The Discharger is required to evaluate the feasibility of utilizing reclaimed municipal wastewater from the new treatment facility for beneficial reuse to reduce area dependence on existing surface and groundwater water supply sources.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** An Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity is required in this Order to ensure adequate measures are developed and implemented by the Discharger to reduce the discharge of salinity to Deer Creek. For example, the Discharger should still be minimizing the use of salt containing substances in their collection system maintenance and in Facility

processes such as additives used for pH adjustment and other chemicals used in the treatment process.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

a. **Emergency Storage Basin Operating Requirements.** The operation and maintenance specifications for the emergency storage basin are necessary to ensure proper operation of the emergency storage basin and minimize the potential for impacts to groundwater quality.

b. **Ultraviolet Disinfection (UV) System Operating Specifications.** UV System specifications and monitoring and reporting is required when the system becomes operational 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 System. Monitoring and reporting of these parameters is necessary to determine compliance with minimum dosage requirements established by the California Department of Public Health, (DPH) and the National Water Research Institute (NWRI) and American Water Works Association Research Foundation NWRI/AWWARF's *"Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse"* first published in December 2000 revised as a Second Edition dated May 2003. In addition, a Memorandum dated 1 November 2004 issued by DPH to Regional Board executive officers recommended that provisions be included in permits to water recycling treatment plants employing UV disinfection requiring Dischargers to establish fixed cleaning frequency of quartz sleeves as well as include provisions that specify minimum delivered UV dose that must be maintained (as recommended by the NWRI/AWWARF UV Disinfection Guidelines).

Turbidity is included as an operational specification as an indicator of the effectiveness of the treatment process and to assure compliance effluent coliform limitations. The tertiary treatment MBR process, proposed for this facility, is capable of reliably meeting a turbidity limitation of 2 nephelometric turbidity units (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% of the time within a 24-hour period; and an instantaneous maximum of 10 NTU.

Minimum UV dosage and turbidity specifications are included as operating criteria in Special Provisions, Section V1.C.5 and Monitoring and Reporting requirements, Attachment E, Section IX.B., to ensure that adequate disinfection of wastewater is achieve.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. Pretreatment Requirements. Not Applicable

b. Sludge/Biosolids Discharge Specifications.

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.

c. Sanitary Sewer Overflow Requirements

i. Sanitary sewer overflows consist of varying mixtures of domestic sewage, industrial wastewater, and commercial wastewater. This mixture depends on the pattern of land use in the sewage collection system tributary to the overflow. The chief causes of sanitary sewer overflows include lack of maintenance; blockages due to grease, roots, and debris; sewer line flood damage; manhole structure failures; vandalism; pumps station mechanical failures; power outages; storm water or groundwater inflow/infiltration; insufficient capacity; and contractor-caused blockages.

ii. Sanitary sewer overflows often contain high levels of suspended solids, pathogenic organisms, toxic pollutants, nutrients, oxygen demanding organic compounds, oil and grease, and other pollutants. Sanitary sewer overflows can cause exceedance of applicable water quality objectives, pose a threat to public health, adversely affect aquatic life, and impair the public recreational use and aesthetic enjoyment of surface waters in the area.

iii. The Discharger is responsible for all necessary steps to adequately maintain and operate its sanitary sewer collection system. The provisions in this Order are included to ensure compliance with the requirements in the 2 May 2006; the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order 2006-0003, a Statewide General WDR for Sanitary Sewer Systems.

6. Other Special Provisions

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 Regional Water Board.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Water Board) is considering the issuance of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Regional Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs. The Regional Water Board encourages public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through local newspaper announcement and Internet posting.

B. Written Comments

The staff determinations are tentative. Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning these tentative WDRs. Comments must be submitted either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Regional Water Board at the address above on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, written comments should be received at the Regional Water Board offices by 5:00 p.m. on 12 January 2009.

C. Public Hearing

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

Date: <Public Hearing Date>
Time: 8:30 am
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

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

Please be aware that dates and venues may change. Our Web address is http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb5/ where you can access the current agenda for changes in dates and locations.

D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions

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

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

E. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge (RWD), related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special provisions, comments received, and other information 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 Regional Water Board by calling 916-464-4620.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional 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 James C. Pedri at 530-224-4845.