

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

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

**ORDER NO. R5-2010-XXXX
NPDES NO. CA0077852**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR
RIO ALTO WATER DISTRICT
LAKE CALIFORNIA WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
TEHAMA COUNTY**

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

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	Rio Alto Water District
Name of Facility	Lake California Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	22099 River View Drive
	Cottonwood, CA 96022
	Tehama County
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have classified this discharge as a minor discharge.	

The discharge by Rio Alto Water District 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	Advanced Secondary Treated Wastewater	40° 19' 59.32" N	122° 12' 39.68" W	Sacramento River

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on:	XX September 2010
This Order shall become effective on:	XX Month 2010
This Order shall expire on:	01 September 2015
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

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that this Order supercedes Order No. R5-2005-0015 except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the CWC (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

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 on **XX XXXXXX 2010**.

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

Table of Contents

I.	Facility Information	4
II.	Findings	4
III.	Discharge Prohibitions.....	9
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications	10
	A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Points D-001	10
	B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable.....	11
	C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable.....	11
V.	Receiving Water Limitations	11
	A. Surface Water Limitations	11
	B. Groundwater Limitations	13
VI.	Provisions	15
	A. Standard Provisions.....	15
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program Requirements.....	19
	C. Special Provisions.....	19
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	19
	2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	20
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention – Not Applicable	23
	4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications.....	23
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)	23
	6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable.....	25
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable	25
VII.	Compliance Determination	25

List of Tables

Table 1.	Discharger Information	1
Table 2.	Discharge Location	1
Table 3.	Administrative Information	1
Table 4.	Facility Information	4
Table 5.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses.....	6
Table 6.	Effluent Limitations - Discharge Points D-001	10

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	E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet.....	F-1
Attachment G – Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis	G-1
Attachment H – Calculation of WQBELs.....	H-1
Attachment I – Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Study	I-1
Attachment J – Dioxin and Furan Sampling.....	J-1

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

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

Table 4. Facility Information

Discharger	Rio Alto Water District
Name of Facility	Lake California Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	22099 River View Drive
	Cottonwood, CA 96022
	Tehama County
Facility Contact, Title, and Phone	Dean Sherrill, Regulatory Supervisor, (530) 347-3835
Mailing Address	Same as Facility Address
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
Facility Design Flow	0.644 million gallons per day (mgd)

II. FINDINGS

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

A. Background. Rio Alto Water District (hereinafter Discharger) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. R5-2005-0015 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0077852. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 12 May 2008, and applied for a NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to 0.644 mgd (monthly average dry weather flow) of treated wastewater from the Lake California Wastewater Treatment Plant, hereinafter Facility. The application was deemed complete on 21 September 2009.

B. Facility Description. The Discharger provides sewerage services for the community of Lake California, which has a population of approximately 1,600. Wastewater enters the Facility through a Palmer Bowlus flume equipped with an ultrasonic flow meter. The wastewater then flows through a headworks structure equipped with a grinder and a bar screen. From the headworks, the wastewater flows to an aeration basin equipped with two aerators. The effluent from the aeration basin flows to a secondary clarifier and then to a secondary effluent holding pond. Secondary effluent from the holding pond is pumped to a chlorine contact chamber where the wastewater is disinfected with sodium hypochlorite and dechlorinated with sodium bisulfite. The secondary effluent can be filtered, as needed to meet effluent limits, through multimedia pressure filters. The facility provides advanced secondary wastewater treatment. In 2009, the average dry weather flow was 0.12 mgd. Each of the unit processes treats all of the flow that enters the Facility on a given day.

The Facility processes sludge using four concrete lined drying beds and one asphalt lined drying bed. Sludge is disposed of offsite at an approved landfill. The Facility has two on-site standby generators for emergency backup.

- C. Legal Authorities.** This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by USEPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (CWC; 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 CWC (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 and G through J are also incorporated into this Order.
- E. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** Under CWC 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 (40 CFR 122.44), require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at 40 CFR Part 133. A detailed discussion of the technology-based effluent limitations development is included in the Fact Sheet.
- G. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs).** Section 301(b) of the CWA and 40 CFR 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards.

40 CFR 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, WQBELs must be established using: (1) USEPA 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 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

- H. Water Quality Control Plans.** The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised September 2009)*, 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. 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. Beneficial uses applicable to the Sacramento River are as follows:

Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Sacramento River (Shasta Dam to the Colusa Basin Drain)	<u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural irrigation and stock watering (AGR); industrial service and power supply (IND and POW); non-contact and body contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting (REC-1 and REC-2); warm and cold freshwater aquatic habitat (WARM and COLD); warm and cold water fish migration habitat (MIGR); warm and cold spawning, reproduction, and/or early development habitat (SPWN); and wildlife habitat (WILD), and navigation (NAV).

The Basin Plan includes a 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.” A TMDL has been proposed for a reach of the Sacramento River associated with the discharge, for unknown toxicity; it is anticipated that the TMDL will be completed by 2019.

Requirements of this Order implement the Basin Plan.

- I. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** USEPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About 40 criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 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 13 February 2001. These rules contain water quality criteria for priority pollutants.
- J. **State Implementation Policy.** On 2 March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on 28 April 28 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by 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 18 May 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by

USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on 24 February 2005 that became effective on 13 July 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.

K. Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements. In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with CWA section 301 and with 40 CFR 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board's *Policy for Compliance Schedules in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits* (Compliance Schedule Policy) allows compliance schedules for new, revised, or newly interpreted water quality objectives or criteria, or in accordance with a TMDL. All compliance schedules must be as short as possible, and may not exceed ten years from the effective date of the adoption, revision, or new interpretation of the applicable water quality objective or criterion, unless a TMDL allows a longer schedule. The Regional Water Board, however, is not required to include a compliance schedule, but may issue a Time Schedule Order pursuant to CWC section 13300 or a Cease and Desist Order pursuant to CWC 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 Compliance Schedule Policy, should consider feasibility of achieving compliance, and must impose a schedule that is as short as possible to achieve compliance with the effluent limit based on the objective or criteria.

The Compliance Schedule Policy and the SIP do not allow compliance schedules for priority pollutants beyond 18 May 2010, except for new or more stringent priority pollutant criteria adopted by USEPA after 17 December 2008.

Where a compliance schedule for a final effluent limitation exceeds one year, the Order must include interim numeric limitations for that constituent or parameter, interim milestones and compliance reporting within 14 days after each interim milestone. The permit may also include interim requirements to control the pollutant, such as pollutant minimization and source control measures. This Order does not include compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations.

L. Alaska Rule. On 30 March 2000, USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised state and tribal water quality standards become effective for CWA purposes. (40 CFR 131.21 and 65 FR 24641 (27 April 2000).) Under the revised regulation (also known as the Alaska rule), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after 30 May 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 30 May 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 effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD₅, TSS, pH, and percent removal. The WQBELs consist of restrictions on pH, zinc,

chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane, and pathogens. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order includes new, or more stringent effluent limitations for pH, zinc, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses.

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 WQBELs were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual WQBELs for priority pollutants are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on 18 May 2000. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to 30 May 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to 30 May 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 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.** 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 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 40 CFR 131.12 and Resolution No. 68-16.
- O. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Section 303(d)(4) and sections 402(o)(2)(A) of the CWA and federal regulations at 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. The effluent limitations in this Order are not less stringent than those in Order No. R5-2005-0015. The establishment of less stringent, or removal of, water quality based effluent limitations based on newly available information, is allowed under Sections 303(d)(4), and 402(o)(2)(A) and (B)(i) of the CWA. The establishment of less stringent, or removal of, technology based effluent limitations based on a facility upgrade is allowed under 40 CFR 122.44(l)(2)(i)(A).
- 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

- Q. Monitoring and Reporting.** 40 CFR 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. CWC sections 13267 and 13383 authorize 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. The 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 40 CFR 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 CFR 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under 40 CFR 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 Fact Sheet.
- S. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in sections IV.B, V.B, and VI.C.4. 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 WDRs 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.

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A.** Discharge of wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in this Order is prohibited.
- B.** The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C.** Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the CWC.

- 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 cause pollution as defined in Section 13050 of the CWC.

IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Points D-001

1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Points D-001

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point D-001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program:

Table 6. Effluent Limitations - Discharge Points D-001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
BOD 5-day @ 20°C	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day	53 ¹	80 ¹	160 ¹	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day	53 ¹	80 ¹	160 ¹	--	--
pH	pH units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Priority Pollutants						
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/l	0.40	--	0.80	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--
Zinc, total	µg/L	9.16	--	18.38	--	--

¹Based upon a design treatment capacity of 0.644 mgd.

- b. **Flow.** Average Dry Weather Flow shall not exceed 0.64 million gallons per day.
- c. **Percent Removal.** The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.
- d. **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.
- e. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** There shall be no toxicity in the effluent discharge.
- f. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:
 - i. 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and

ii. 0.019 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.

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

- i. 23 most probable number (MPN) per 100mL, as a 7-day median,
- ii. 240 MPN/100mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and,
- iii. 500 MPN/100mL, as a daily maximum.

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 the Sacramento River:

- 1. Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than 10 percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
- 2. Biostimulatory Substances.** Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 3. Chemical Constituents.** Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 4. Color.** Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
- 5. Dissolved Oxygen.** Discharger shall not cause the following:
 - a.** The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass and the 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation.
 - b.** The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time between 1 September and 31 May of each year.
 - c.** The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 9.0 mg/L at any time between 1 June and 31 August of each year.

- 6. Electrical Conductivity (at 25°C).** Shall not exceed 230 micromhos/cm (umhos/cm) (50 percentile) or 235 umhos/cm (90 percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain; or 240 umhos/cm (50 percentile) or 340 umhos/cm (90 percentile) at I Street Bridge, based upon the previous 10 years of record.
- 7. Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 8. 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.
- 9. pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5, raised above 8.5. In determining compliance with the above limitations, appropriate averaging periods may be applied upon approval by the Executive Officer.

10. 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 CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 15; nor
- g.** Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.

11. 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.**
 - a. Shall not exceed 2 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU;
 - b. Shall not increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs;
 - c. Shall not increase more than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs;
 - d. Shall not increase more than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs; nor
 - e. Shall not increase more than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

B. Groundwater Limitations

- 1.** Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility shall not cause or contribute to, in combination with other sources of the waste constituents, groundwater within influence of the Facility to contain:
 - a. Taste or odor-producing constituents, toxic substances, or any other constituents, in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses;

- b.** Waste constituent concentrations in excess of water quality objectives or background water quality, whichever is greater; and
- c.** Waste constituent concentrations in excess of the concentrations specified below or background water quality, whichever is greater:
- d.** Total coliform organisms to exceed 2.2 MPN/100mL over any seven-day period.

VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions.

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (federal NPDES standard conditions from 40 CFR Part 122) 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 CWA, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.
- *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 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. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
- i. Safeguard to electric power failure:
 - i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.
 - ii. Upon written request by the 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 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the 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 90 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.
- j. 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 contained in section VI.A.2.i. of this Order.

The technical report shall:

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

The 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.

- k. A publicly owned treatment works whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the 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.

- l.** The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with Title 16, CCR, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.
- m.** The 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.
- n.** For publicly owned treatment works, 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).
- o.** 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 (530) 224-4845 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within 5 days, unless the Regional Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by the Standard Provision contained in Attachment D section V.E.1. [40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(i)].
- p.** Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.
- q.** In the event 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 CWC. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program Requirements

The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E of this Order.

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a.** Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR 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.
- b.** This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not limited to, fish tissue sampling, whole effluent toxicity, monitoring requirements on internal waste stream(s), and monitoring for surrogate parameters. Additional requirements may be included in this Order as a result of the special condition monitoring data.
- c. Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).** This Order may be reopened, and appropriate effluent limitations, or other controls, prescribed, in order to implement any TMDLs.

- d. Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a new chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on the new provisions.
- e. Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** This Order requires the Discharger to prepare a Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP). This reopener provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for salinity based on review and implementation of the SEMF.
- f. Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for inorganic constituents. An acceptable WER can be used to adjust aquatic life-based water quality standards. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators and submits an approved report, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable constituents.
- g. Reasonable Potential for Constituents with Insufficient Information.** This Order may be reopened, and appropriate effluent limitations added, if results from the Monitoring and Reporting Program indicate additional constituents are present at concentrations that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality criteria or objectives.

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP).** The Discharger shall prepare a Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP) to identify sources of salinity in effluent from the Facility, and measures available to minimize the concentration and mass loading of salinity. The plan, including a proposed schedule to implement the identified minimization measures, shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board within 1 year of the effective date of this Order for approval by the Executive Officer. Following SEMF approval, the Discharger shall implement the applicable minimization measures according to the approved schedule.
- b. 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 (WET) 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 exhibits toxicity as described in

subsection ii below, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Workplan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent recurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of 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 Workplan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.

- i. **TRE Workplan.** Within **6 months** of the effective date of this Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board a TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Workplan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating effluent toxicity. The TRE Workplan must be developed in accordance with USEPA guidance¹ and be of adequate detail to allow the Discharger to immediately initiate a TRE as required in this Provision.
- 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. The Discharger shall initiate a TRE to address effluent toxicity if any WET testing results exceed the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring.
- iii. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger to initiate a TRE is $> 1 \text{ TU}_c$ (where $\text{TU}_c = 100/\text{NOEC}$). 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 when the effluent exhibits toxicity.
- iv. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring within 14 days of notification by the laboratory of the exceedance. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four (4) chronic toxicity tests conducted once every 2 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

¹ See the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, section VII.B.2.a. for a list of USEPA guidance documents that must be considered in the development of the TRE Workplan.)

evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

- (b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (e.g., temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four (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, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and begin 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 any test result 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 a TRE WET monitoring schedule;
 - (2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
 - (3) A schedule for these actions.

c. Effluent and Receiving water Characterization Study. An effluent and receiving water monitoring study is required to ensure adequate information is available for the next permit renewal. During the third and fourth year of this permit term, the Discharger shall conduct monitoring of the effluent at EFF-001 and of the receiving water at RSW-001 for all priority pollutants and other constituents of concern as described in Attachment I. Dioxin and Furan sampling shall be performed only during the third year, as described in Attachment J. The report shall be completed in conformance with the following schedule.

<u>Task</u>	<u>Compliance Date</u>
i. Submit Work Plan and Time Schedule	No later than 2 years from adoption of this Order
ii. Conduct required monitoring ¹	During third and fourth years of permit term
iii. Submit Final Report	6 months following completion of final monitoring event

¹ Dioxin and Furan sampling shall be performed during the third year, as described in Attachment J.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention – Not Applicable

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

- a. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger)
- b. As a means of discerning compliance with Special Provision 4(a), the dissolved oxygen content in the upper zone (1 foot) of wastewater in ponds shall not be less than 1.0 mg/L.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. Pretreatment Requirements – Not applicable.

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 (e.g., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a Regional Water 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 in section V.B. of this Order. In addition, the storage of residual sludge, solid waste, and biosolids on Facility property shall be temporary and controlled, and contained in a manner that minimizes leachate formation and precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations included in section V.B. of this Order.
- 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 Part 503. If the State Water Board and the Regional Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 CFR Part 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must

comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 CFR Part 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 USEPA 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 2 May 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003, a Statewide General WDR for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order No. 2006-0003 and any future revisions thereto. Order No. 2006-0003 requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the General WDR. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under State Water Board Order 2006-0003 for operation of its wastewater collection system.

Regardless of the coverage obtained under Order No. 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 122.41(e)], report any non-compliance [40 CFR 122.41(l)(6) and (7)], and mitigate any discharge from the collection system in violation of this Order [40 CFR 122.41(d)].

6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

A. BOD₅ and TSS Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.a). Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a. shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples or other representative approach approved by the Executive Officer (samples taken from the outlet structure of a pond will be considered adequately composited). Compliance with effluent limitations required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.b. for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD₅ and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

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

C. Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.d.).
For a 7-day median: 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 6 days that samples were collected and analyzed. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a most probable number (MPN) of 23 per 100 milliliters, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance. If multiple samples are collected and analyzed on a single day, the arithmetic mean of those samples shall be used to represent the result for that day.

For a monthly median: For each calendar month, the median value of all the effluent samples collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms during that month shall be compared to the monthly median effluent limit. If the median value of the effluent samples exceeds the monthly median effluent limit, then the discharge will be considered out of compliance for that month with respect to the monthly median limit. If multiple samples are collected and analyzed on a single day, the arithmetic mean of those samples shall be used to represent the result for that day.

D. Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.e.). 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. Records supporting validation of false positives shall be maintained in accordance with Section IV Standard Provisions (Attachment D).

- E. Annual Average Effluent Limitations.** Annual average effluent constituent concentrations for determining compliance with the annual average effluent limitation for electrical conductivity shall be performed as the average value of each averaging period required in the Monitoring and Reporting Program. For example, if monthly effluent monitoring is required, the annual average would be the average of all the monthly samples during discharge to the Sacramento River.
- F. Annual Average Mass Discharge for BOD and TSS.** Compliance with the annual average mass effluent limitation for BOD and TSS shall be calculated by adding up all the effluent samples for either BOD or TSS during discharge to the Sacramento River divided by the total days of discharge to surface waters.
- G. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Effluent Limitation (Section IV).** Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE/TIE provision of Provision VI.C.2.a shall constitute compliance with the effluent limitation.

A.

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.

Bioaccumulative

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

Carcinogenic

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

Coefficient of Variation (CV)

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

Daily Discharge

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

The daily discharge may be determined by the analytical results of a composite sample taken over the course of 1 day (a calendar day or other 24-hour period defined as a day) or by the arithmetic mean of analytical results from one or more grab samples taken over the course of the day.

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

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

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

Dilution Credit

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

Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)

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

Enclosed Bays

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

Estimated Chemical Concentration

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

Estuaries

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

Inland Surface Waters

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

Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation

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

Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation

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

Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

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

Median

The middle measurement in a set of data. The median of a set of data is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of measurements (n) is odd, then the median = $X_{(n+1)/2}$. If n is even, then the median = $(X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1})/2$ (i.e., the midpoint between the $n/2$ and $n/2+1$).

Method Detection Limit (MDL)

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

Minimum Level (ML)

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

Mixing Zone

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

Not Detected (ND)

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

Ocean Waters

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

Persistent Pollutants

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

Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

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

Pollution Prevention

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

Reporting Level (RL)

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

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

Source of Drinking Water

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

Standard Deviation (σ)

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

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

where:

x is the observed value;


μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and

n is the number of samples.

Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

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


B.
ATTACHMENT B – MAP




Drawing Reference:
BEND QUAD
U.S.G.S TOPOGRAPHIC MAP
7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE
Not to scale

SITE LOCATION MAP

RIO ALTO WATER DISTRICT
LAKE CALIFORNIA WASTEWATER
TREATMENT PLANT
TEHAMA COUNTY



C.
ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC



D.

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 (CWC) and is grounds for enforcement action, for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a permit renewal application. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(e).)

E. Property Rights

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(i); CWC section 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CWC, any substances or parameters at any location. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(m)(4)(i)):
 - a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(n)(3)):
 - a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 CFR 122.41(n)(3)(i));
 - b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
 - d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CWC. (40 CFR 122.41(l)(3) and 122.61.)

III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

- A. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 CFR 122.41(j)(1).)
- B. Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures under 40 CFR Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under 40 CFR Part 136 unless otherwise specified in 40 CFR Part 503 unless other test procedures have been specified in this Order. (40 CFR 122.41(j)(4) and 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 5 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 CFR 122.41(j)(2).)

B. Records of monitoring information shall include:

1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(i));
2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
6. The results of such analyses. (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)

C. Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 CFR 122.7(b)):

1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 CFR 122.7(b)(1)); and
2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(h); Wat. 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.22(b)(2)); and
 - c. The written authorization is submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 CFR Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under 40 CFR Part 136 unless otherwise specified in 40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(i).)

2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):
 - a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
 - b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(l)(1)):

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in 40 CFR 122.29(b) (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CWC, 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.42(b)(3).)

E.

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Table of Contents

I.	General Monitoring Provisions.....	E-2
II.	Monitoring Locations	E-4
III.	Influent Monitoring Requirements.....	E-4
	A. Monitoring Location INF-001.....	E-4
IV.	Effluent Monitoring Requirements	E-4
	A. Monitoring Location EFF-001.....	E-4
V.	Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements	E-6
VI.	Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable	E-9
VII.	Reclamation Monitoring Requirements - Not applicable.....	E-9
VIII.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Surface Water.....	E-9
	A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002	E-9
IX.	Other Monitoring Requirements.....	E-10
	A. Biosolids	E-10
	B. Municipal Water Supply	E-11
	C. Pond Monitoring Requirements	E-11
X.	Reporting Requirements.....	E-12
	A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	E-12
	B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs)	E-12
	C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs)	E-15
	D. Other Reports	E-16

List of Tables

Table E-1.	Monitoring Station Locations	E-4
Table E-2.	Influent Monitoring.....	E-4
Table E-3.	Effluent Monitoring	E-5
Table E-4.	Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series.....	E-7
Table E-5.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-001 ...	E-9
Table E-6.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-002 .	E-10
Table E-7.	Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements.....	E-11
Table E-8.	Pond Monitoring	E-11
Table E-9.	Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule.....	E-12

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), section 122.48 (40 CFR 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. California Water Code (CWC) sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) to require technical and monitoring reports. This Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements, which implement the federal and California regulations.

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

- A.** Samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. All samples shall be taken at the monitoring locations specified below and, unless otherwise specified, before the monitored flow joins or is diluted by any other waste stream, body of water, or substance. Monitoring locations shall not be changed without notification to and the approval of this Regional Water Board.
- B.** Effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.
- C.** Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the Department of Public Health (DPH); formerly the Department of Health Services). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Regional Water Board. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger for any onsite field measurements such as pH, turbidity, temperature and residual chlorine, such analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program must be kept onsite in the treatment facility 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.
- D.** Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.
- E.** Monitoring results, including noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.

- F.** Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by DPH, in accordance with the provision of CWC section 13176, and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports.
- G.** 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.
- H.** The Discharger shall file with the Regional Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- I.** 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.

II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

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

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	Influent monitoring location, at headworks
D-001	EFF-001	Outfall to the Sacramento River
--	RSW-001	Sacramento River - 500 feet upstream of discharge location D-001
--	RSW-002	Sacramento River - 200 feet downstream of discharge location D-001
--	PND-001	Wastewater holding pond
--	SPL-001	Municipal water supply
--	BIO-001	Composite sample of biosolids

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

- 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	²
Conventional Pollutants				
BOD, 5-day 20°C	mg/L, lbs/day	24-Hr. Composite ¹	1/week	²
pH	Standard Units	Grab	1/day	²
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L, lbs/day	Grab	1/week	²
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	Umhos/cm	Grab	1/month	²

¹ 24-hour flow proportional composite, or other representative approach approved by the Executive Officer.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136.

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

- Discharger shall monitor treated effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 (for continuous and emergency discharges from Discharge Point No. 001) as follows. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding Minimum Level.

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	mgd	Meter	Continuous	1
Conventional Pollutants				
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Day	1
BOD, 5-day @ 20 Deg. C	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	1/Week	1
	lbs/day	Calculated	1/Week	1
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	1/Week	1
	lbs/day	Calculated	1/Week	1
Oil and Grease	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	1
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Temperature	°F	Grab	1/Day	1
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/Day	1
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	umhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	1
Total Coliform Organisms ³	MPN/100mL	Grab	1/Week	1
Chlorine, Total Residual ^{2,3}	mg/L	Meter	Continuous ²	1
Ammonia (as N) ⁵	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Week	1
Hardness ⁶	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Nitrate Nitrogen Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1
Sulfate	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1
Chloride	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1
Aluminum	ug/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1
Priority Pollutants				
Copper, Total	ug/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Zinc, Total	ug/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Standard Minerals ⁷	ug/L	Grab	1/Year	1
Acute Toxicity (see Section V. below)	% survival	Grab	1/Year	1
Whole Effluent Toxicity ⁸ (see Section V. below)	--	--	Twice during the permit cycle	--
Priority Pollutants ^{9, 10}	ug/L	Grab ¹¹	Twice during the permit cycle ¹²	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 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. If the discharge is not continuous, then hourly sampling during discharge, rather than continuous sampling, is acceptable, at the discretion of the Executive Officer.
- ³ To be sampled after the chlorine contact basin.
- ⁴ 24-hour flow proportioned composite or other representative approach approved by the Executive Officer (Effluent samples collected from the outlet structure of ponds shall be considered adequately composited).
- ⁵ Concurrent with biotoxicity monitoring; pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection. Must use a lab method that is accurate to the hundredths.
- ⁶ Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.
- ⁷ Standard minerals shall include the following: aluminum, 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).
- ⁸ Samples shall be collected during years 3 and 4, concurrent with priority pollutant monitoring.
- ⁹ 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.
- ¹⁰ Concurrent with receiving surface water sampling.
- ¹¹ Volatile samples and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate shall be grab samples, the remainder shall be 24-hour composite samples or other representative approach approved by the Executive Officer (Effluent from ponds shall be considered adequately composited).
- ¹² Samples shall be during the 3rd and 4th year of the permit term.

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Acute Toxicity Testing. The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing acute toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following acute toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform **annual** acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling.
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 collected at the effluent monitoring location EFF-001.
3. Test Species – Test species shall be rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).
4. Methods – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.

5. Test Failure – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 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 three species chronic toxicity testing; tests shall be performed **annually concurrent with priority pollutant monitoring**.
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be grab samples and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be collected at the effluent monitoring location EFF-001. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from sampling location RSW-001, as identified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
3. Sample Volumes – Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.
4. Test Species – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:
 - 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.
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 the table, below. The receiving water control shall be used as the diluent (unless the receiving water is toxic).

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	0	25	50	75	87.5	100	0
% Laboratory Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

8. **Test Failure** – The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than fourteen (14) days after receiving notification of a test failure. A test failure is defined as follows:

- a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual), and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or
- b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in Table 6 on page 52 of the Method Manual. (A retest is only required in this case if the test results do not exceed the monitoring trigger specified in the Special Provision at section VI. 2.a.iii. of the Order.)

C. WET Testing Notification Requirements. The Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board within 24-hours after the receipt of test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during regular or accelerated monitoring, or an exceedance of the acute toxicity effluent limitation.

D. WET Testing Reporting Requirements. All toxicity test reports shall include the contracting laboratory’s complete report provided to the Discharger and shall be in accordance with the appropriate “Report Preparation and Test Review” sections of the method manuals. At a minimum, whole effluent toxicity monitoring shall be reported as follows:

- 1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Regular chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Regional Water Board within 30 days following completion of the test, and shall contain, at minimum:
 - a. The results expressed in TUC, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as 100/LC50, 100/EC25, 100/IC25, and 100/IC50, as appropriate.
 - b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;
 - c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the percent minimum significant difference (PMSD);
 - d. The dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test; and

- e. The results compared to the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger.

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

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VII. RECLAMATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS - NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – SURFACE WATER

A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at RSW-001, when discharging to the Sacramento River at Discharge Point No. 001 as follows:

Table E-5. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-001

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
<i>Conventional Pollutants</i>				
pH	standard units	Grab	1/month	1
Total and Fecal Coliform	MPN/100mL	Grab	1/month	2
<i>Non-Conventional Pollutants</i>				
Temperature	°F	Grab	1/month	1
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/month	1
Electrical Conductivity	umhos/cm	Grab	1/month	1
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/month	1
Hardness	mg/L	Grab	1/month	2

Ammonia (as N) ⁵	mg/L	Grab	1/month	2
Standard Minerals ⁶	ug/L	Grab	1/Year	2
Priority Pollutants				
Priority Pollutants ^{3,4}	ug/L	Grab	2 times in the permit cycle ⁵	2

- ¹ 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 wastewater treatment plant.
- ² 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.
- ³ 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. Volatile samples and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate shall be grab samples, the remainder shall be 24-hour composite samples or other representative approach approved by the Executive Officer (Effluent from ponds shall be considered adequately composited).
- ⁴ Concurrent with effluent priority pollutant sampling.
- ⁵ Samples shall be collected during the 3rd and 4th year of the permit term.
- ⁶ Standard minerals shall include the following: aluminum, 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).

2. The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at RSW-002, when discharging to the Sacramento River at Discharge Point No. 001 as follows:

Table E-6. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Monitoring Location RSW-002

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Conventional Pollutants				
pH	standard units	Grab	1/month	1
Total and Fecal Coliform	MPN/100mL	Grab	1/month	2
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Temperature	°F	Grab	1/month	1
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/month	1
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/month	1
Hardness	mg/L	Grab	1/month	2

- ¹ 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 wastewater treatment plant.
- ² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136.
- ³ Concurrent with effluent priority pollutant sampling.

IX. 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 metals listed in 40 CFR Part 122, Appendix D, Table III (excluding total phenols).
- b. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of 5 years. A log shall be maintained of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log must be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.

B. Municipal Water Supply

1. Monitoring Location SPL-001

The Discharger shall monitor the municipal water supply at 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-7. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Total Dissolved Solids ¹	mg/L	Grab	1/year	²
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C ¹	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/year	²
Copper, Total	ug/L	Grab	1/year	²
Zinc, Total	ug/L	Grab	1/year	²
Standard Minerals ³	ug/L	Grab	1/year	²

¹ If the water supply is from more than one source, the total dissolved solids and electrical conductivity shall be reported as a weighted average and include copies of supporting calculations.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by their Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.

³ Standard minerals shall include the following: aluminum, 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).

C. Pond Monitoring Requirements

1. Monitoring Locations PND-001

The Discharger shall monitor the wastewater holding pond at PND-001 as follows.

Table E-8. Pond Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Liquid Depth and Freeboard	Feet	Visual/ Measurement	1/Month	Visual
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	¹

¹ 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 wastewater treatment plant.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.
2. Upon written request of the 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 – Not Applicable**
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.

B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

1. At any time during the term of this permit, the State Water Board or the 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. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit monthly SMRs including the results of all required monitoring using USEPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.
3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

Table E-9. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	First day of the calendar month following the permit effective date	All	1 st day of 2 nd calendar month

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
	or on permit effective date if that date is first day of the month		following month of sampling
1/Hour	First day of the calendar month following the permit effective date or on permit effective date if that date is first day of the month	Hourly	1 st day of 2 nd calendar month following month of sampling
1/Day	First day of the calendar month following the permit effective date or on permit effective date if that date is first day of the month	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	1 st day of 2 nd calendar month following month of sampling
1/Week	First Sunday of the calendar month following the permit effective date or on permit effective date if on a Sunday>	Sunday through Saturday	1 st day of 2 nd calendar month following month of sampling
1/Month	First day of calendar month following permit effective date or on permit effective date if that date is first day of the month	First day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	1 st day of 2 nd calendar month following month of sampling
1/Quarter	Closest of 1 January, 1 April, 1 July, or 1 October following (or on) permit effective date	1 January through 31 March 1 April through 30 June 1 July through 30 September 1 October through 31 December	1 May 1 August 1 November 1 February
1/Year	1 January following (or on) permit effective date	1 January through 31 December	1 st day of 2 nd calendar month following month of sampling
Twice during permit cycle	1 January following (or on) permit effective date	1 January through permit term	1 st day of 2 nd calendar month following month of sampling

4. Reporting Protocols. The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable reported Minimum Level (ML) and the current Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 CFR Part 136.

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

- a. Sample results greater than or equal to the reported ML 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

entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.

- b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the WDRs; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.
- c. 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
415 Knollcrest, Suite 100
Redding, CA 96002

- 8. Reports must clearly show when discharging to EFF-001 or other permitted locations. Reports must show the date and time that the Discharge started and stopped at each location.

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 Water Board 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, 15 th 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 will not be accepted unless they follow the exact same format of EPA Form 3320-1.

D. Other Reports

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. **Annual Operations Report.** By **30 January** 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.
- f. The Discharger is not required to submit annual pretreatment reports.

F.

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Table of Contents

I. Permit Information F-3

II. Facility Description F-4

 A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls F-4

 B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters F-4

 C. Summary of Historical Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data F-5

 D. Compliance Summary F-5

 E. Planned Changes F-6

III. Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations F-6

 A. Legal Authorities F-6

 B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) F-6

 C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans F-6

 D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List F-8

 E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations F-8

IV. Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications F-8

 A. Discharge Prohibitions F-10

 B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations F-10

 1. Scope and Authority F-10

 2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations F-11

 C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) F-12

 1. Scope and Authority F-12

 2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives F-12

 3. Determining the Need for WQBELs F-17

 4. WQBEL Calculations F-26

 5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) F-29

 D. Final Effluent Limitations F-31

 1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations F-32

 2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations F-32

 3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements F-32

 4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy F-32

 5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants F-33

 E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable F-33

 F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable F-33

 G. Reclamation Specifications - Not Applicable F-33

V. Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations F-33

 A. Surface Water F-34

 B. Groundwater F-34

VI. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements F-35

 A. Influent Monitoring F-35

 B. Effluent Monitoring F-35

 C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements F-36

 D. Receiving Water Monitoring F-36

 1. Surface Water F-36

- 2. Groundwater - Not Applicable F-36
- E. Other Monitoring Requirements F-36
 - 1. Biosolids Monitoring..... F-36
 - 2. Water Supply Monitoring..... F-36
 - 3. Pond Monitoring..... F-36
- VII. Rationale for Provisions..... F-36
 - A. Standard Provisions..... F-36
 - B. Special Provisions..... F-37
 - 1. Reopener Provisions..... F-37
 - 2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements..... F-38
 - 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention – Not Applicable. F-42
 - 4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications..... F-42
 - 5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) F-42
 - 6. Other Special Provisions..... F-43
 - 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable F-43
- VIII. Public Participation F-43
 - A. Notification of Interested Parties F-43
 - B. Written Comments F-43
 - C. Public Hearing F-43
 - D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions..... F-44
 - E. Information and Copying..... F-44
 - F. Register of Interested Persons F-44
 - G. Additional Information F-44

List of Tables

- Table F-1. Facility Information F-3
- Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data for Discharge Point D-001.... F-5
- Table F-3. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations, F-11
- Table F-4. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses F-13
- Table F-8. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives..... F-23
- Table F-9. WQBEL Calculations for Chlorodibromomethane at F-27
 Discharge Point D-001..... F-27
- Table F-10. WQBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane at F-27
 Discharge Point D-001..... F-27
- Table F-11. WQBEL Calculations for Zinc at Discharge Point D-001 F-28
- Table F-12. Summary of Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations F-28
- Table F-13. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations for Discharge Point D-001 F-31

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in the Findings 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	5A520104001
Discharger	Rio Alto Water District
Name of Facility	Lake California Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	22099 River View Drive
	Cottonwood, CA 96022
	Tehama County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	Dean Sherrill, Regulatory Supervisor, (530) 347-3835
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	Dean Sherrill, Regulatory Supervisor, (530) 347-3835
Mailing Address	Same as Facility Address
Billing Address	Same as Facility Address
Type of Facility	POTW
Major or Minor Facility	Minor
Threat to Water Quality	2
Complexity	B
Pretreatment Program	N
Reclamation Requirements	None
Facility Permitted Flow	0.64 million gallons per day (mgd) average dry weather flow (ADWF)
Facility Design Flow	0.64 mgd (ADWF)
Watershed	Enterprise Flat Hydrologic Area No. 508.10
Receiving Water	Sacramento River
Receiving Water Type	Inland surface waters

- A. Rio Alto Water District (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the Lake California Wastewater Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a Publicly Owned Treatment Works.

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 the Sacramento River (downstream of Shasta Dam and above the Colusa Basin Drain), a water of the United States, and is currently regulated by Order No. R5-2005-0015, which was adopted on 27 January 2005 and expired on 1 January 2010. The terms and conditions of the current Order have been automatically continued and remain in effect until new Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (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 12 May 2008 and was deemed complete on 21 September 2009.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the community of Lake California, which serves a population of approximately 1,600. The design average dry weather flow capacity of the Facility is 0.64 million gallons per day (mgd). The Facility provides advanced secondary treatment of the wastewater.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls

Wastewater enters the Facility through a Palmer Bowlus flume equipped with an ultrasonic flow meter. The wastewater then flows through a headworks structure equipped with a grinder and a bar screen. From the headworks, the wastewater flows to an aeration basin equipped with two aerators. The effluent from the aeration basin flows to a secondary clarifier and then to a secondary effluent holding pond. Secondary effluent from the holding pond is pumped to a chlorine contact chamber where the wastewater is disinfected with sodium hypochlorite and dechlorinated with sodium bisulfite. The secondary effluent can be filtered, as needed to meet effluent limits, through multimedia pressure filters. In 2009, the average dry weather flow was 0.12 mgd. Each of the unit processes treats all of the flow that enters the Facility on a given day.

The Facility processes sludge using four concrete lined drying beds and one asphalt lined drying bed. Sludge is disposed of offsite at an approved landfill. The Facility has two on-site standby generators for emergency backup.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

- 1.** The Facility is located in Section 28, T29N, R9W, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.

2. The Facility and discharge points lie within the Enterprise Flat Hydrologic Unit No. 508.10, as depicted on interagency hydrologic maps prepared by the State of California Department of water Resources (1986).
3. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point No. 001 to the Sacramento River (below the Shasta Dam and above Colusa Basin Drain), a water of the United States at a point latitude 40° 19' 59.32" N and longitude 122° 12' 39.68" W.

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

Effluent limitations contained in Order No. R5-2005-0015 for discharges from Discharge Point D-001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order No. R5-2005-0015 are as follows:

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data for Discharge Point D-001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Monitoring Data 1 April 2007 – 31 March 2010	
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Max Daily	4-day Max	Monthly Median	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Effluent Limitations for discharge to the Sacramento River								
Average Dry Weather Flow	mgd	0.64	--	--	--	--	0.283	0.668
BOD ₅ ¹	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	8.2	190
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	9.0	17
Settleable Solids	mL/L	0.1	--	0.2	--	--	<0.1	0.2
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	--	0.02 ²	0.01	--	0.0093	0.02
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100mL	--	23 ³	500	--	--	--	130
pH	pH units	6.0	--	9.0	--	--	6.7	6.5/8.2

¹5-day 20°C Biochemical oxygen demand.

²1-hour average.

³7-day Median.

D. Compliance Summary

On 31 August and 1 September 2008, the Discharger failed to adequately disinfect wastewater discharged to the Sacramento River. This event was caused by operator error.

The Facility has conducted operator training and implemented controls to prevent this action from occurring in the future. This event did not trigger mandatory minimum penalties per California Water Code Section 13385(i).

E. Planned Changes

This permit contains newly applicable effluent limits for zinc, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane. The Discharger is evaluating potential alternatives for maintaining compliance with this permit. Some options may require facility upgrades. Such changes are unknown at this time and are not addressed by this permit.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the applicable plans, policies, and regulations identified in the Findings in section II of this Order. This section provides supplemental information, where appropriate, for the plans, policies, and regulations relevant to the discharge.

A. Legal Authorities

This Order is issued pursuant to regulations in the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code (CWC) as specified in the Finding contained at section II.C of this Order.

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

This Order meets the requirements of CEQA as specified in the Finding contained at section II.E of this Order.

C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans

- 1. Water Quality Control Plans.** This Order implements the following water quality control plans as specified in the Finding contained at section II.H of this Order.
 - a.** Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised September 2009), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan).
- 2. National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** This Order implements the NTR and CTR as specified in the Finding contained at section II.I of this Order.
- 3. State Implementation Policy (SIP).** This Order implements the SIP as specified in the Finding contained at section II.I of this Order.
- 4. Alaska Rule.** This Order is consistent with the Alaska Rule as specified in the Finding contained at section II.L of this Order.
- 5. Antidegradation Policy.** As specified in the Finding contained at section II.N of this Order and 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 Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Resolution 68-16.

- 6. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** This Order is consistent with anti-backsliding policies as specified in the Finding contained at section II.M of this Order. Compliance with the anti-backsliding requirements is discussed in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section IV.D.3).

7. Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act

Section 13263.6(a) of the CWC, requires that *“the Regional Water Board shall prescribe effluent limitations as part of the waste discharge requirements of a POTW for all substances that the most recent toxic chemical release data reported to the state emergency response commission pursuant to Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 11023) (EPCRA) indicate as discharged into the POTW, for which the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board has established numeric water quality objectives, and has determined that the discharge is or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to, an excursion above any numeric water quality objective”*.

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

8. Storm Water 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. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The Discharger is not regulated under the storm water program because all storm water is contained on site.

- 9. Endangered Species Act.** This Order is consistent with the Endangered Species Act as specified in the Finding contained at section II.P of this Order.

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

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 CWA, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. The waters on these lists do not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 30 November 2006 USEPA gave final approval to California's 2006 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 Part 130, et seq.)*.” The Basin Plan also states, “*Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.*” The 2006 CWA section 303d listing includes the Sacramento River from Cottonwood Creek to Red Bluff. This segment of the Sacramento River is listed for “unknown toxicity” due to an “unknown source”. Proposed TMDL completion date for this segment is 2019.
2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).** USEPA requires the Regional Water Board to develop TMDLs for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination.
3. The 303(d) listings and TMDLs have been considered in the development of the Order. A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation of each pollutant of concern is described in section VI.C.3. of this Fact Sheet.

E. Other Plans, Policies 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 discharge requirements are consistent with water quality objectives; and
 - c. The treatment and storage facilities described herein are associated with a municipal wastewater treatment plant.

IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

Effluent limitations and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to sections 301 (Effluent Limitations), 302 (Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations), 304

(Information and Guidelines), and 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards) of the CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The CWA mandates the implementation of effluent limitations that are as stringent as necessary to meet water quality standards established pursuant to state or federal law [33 U.S.C., §1311(b)(1)(C); 40 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 dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 CFR 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 CFR 122.44(d) requires that permits include WQBELs to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where numeric water quality objectives have not been established. The Basin Plan at page IV-17.00, contains an implementation policy, “*Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*”, that specifies that the 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) USEPA’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 includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, discoloration, radionuclides, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at III-8.00.) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, “*...water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant*

levels (MCLs)” in Title 22 of CCR. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: “Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.”

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. 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 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation, provided that the bypass does not cause violation of effluent and/or receiving water limitations.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

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

Regulations promulgated in 40 CFR 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 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

- a. BOD₅ and TSS.** Federal regulations at 40 CFR Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD₅ and TSS. The Regional Board has determined that advanced secondary treatment is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream, and the final effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS are based on the technical capability of the advanced secondary process. BOD₅ is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The secondary and advanced secondary treatment standards for BOD₅ and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the treatment processes. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD₅ and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. In applying 40 CFR Part 133 for weekly and monthly average BOD₅ and TSS limitations, the application of advanced secondary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD₅ and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed; therefore, consistent with Order No. R5-2005-0037, this Order includes 30-day average BOD₅ and TSS limitations of 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of an advanced secondary system. In addition to the average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations, a daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD₅ and TSS is included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. 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 BOD₅ and TSS must be achieved by a secondary treatment plant, it must also be achieved by an advanced secondary treatment plant. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS over each calendar month.
- b. Flow.** The Facility was designed to provide an advanced secondary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 0.64 mgd. Therefore, this Order contains an average dry weather discharge flow effluent limit of 0.64 mgd.
- c. pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 CFR Part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units.

Table F-3. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations, Discharge Point D-001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD ₅	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
	lbs/day	53 ¹	80 ¹	160 ¹	--	--
TSS	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day	53 ¹	80 ¹	160 ¹	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Average Dry Weather Flow	mgd	0.64	--	--	--	--
% Removal	85% removal BOD ₅ and TSS					

¹ Based on design flow of 0.64 mgd.

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority.

Section 301(b) of the CWA and 40 CFR 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards.

40 CFR 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, WQBELs must be established using: (1) USEPA 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 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

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

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

The Basin Plan on page II-1.00 states: “*Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning...*” and with

respect to disposal of wastewaters states that “...*disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses.*”

The federal CWA section 101(a)(2), states: “*it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1, 1983.*” Federal Regulations, developed to implement the requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the State regulated to protect the beneficial uses of public water supply, protection and propagation of fish, shell fish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation. Section 131.3(e), 40 CFR, defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after 28 November 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR section 131.10 requires that uses be obtained by implementing effluent limitations, requires that all downstream uses be protected and states that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a beneficial use for any waters of the United States.

a. Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.

Beneficial uses applicable to the Sacramento River below Shasta Dam and above the Colusa Basin Drain are as follows:

Table F-4. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Sacramento River	Existing: Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); Irrigation and stock watering (AGR); Service supply (IND) and power (POW); water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); migration of aquatic organisms, warm and cold (MIGR); spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, warm and cold (SPWN); wildlife habitat (WILD), and navigation (NAV).

b. Effluent and Ambient Background Data. The reasonable potential analysis (RPA), as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data from 1 April 2007 through 31 March 2010, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMRs and the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).

c. Hardness-Dependent CTR Metals Criteria

The *California Toxics Rule* and the *National Toxics Rule* contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.

This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness as required by the SIP¹, the CTR² and State Water Board Order No. WQO 2008-0008 (City of Davis). The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. (SIP, § 1.2; 40 CFR § 131.38(c)(4), Table 4, note 4.) The CTR does not define whether the term “ambient,” as applied in the regulations, necessarily requires the consideration of upstream as opposed to downstream hardness conditions. In some cases, the hardness of effluent discharges changes the hardness of the ambient receiving water. Therefore, where reliable, representative data are available, the hardness value for calculating criteria can be the downstream receiving water hardness, after mixing with the effluent (Order WQO 2008-0008, p. 11). The Regional Water Board thus has considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness (*Id.*, p.10.).

The hardness values must also be protective under all flow conditions (*Id.*, pp. 10-11) as discussed below.

- i. **Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA).** The SIP in Section 1.3 states, “The RWQCB shall...determine whether a discharge may: (1) cause, (2) have a reasonable potential to cause, or (3) contribute to an excursion above any applicable priority pollutant criterion or objective.” Section 1.3 provides a step-by-step procedure for conducting the RPA. The procedure requires the comparison of the Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) and Maximum Ambient Background Concentration to the applicable criterion that has been properly adjusted for hardness. Unless otherwise noted, for the hardness-dependent CTR metals criteria, the following procedures were followed for properly adjusting the criterion for hardness when conducting the RPA.
 - For comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, in accordance with the SIP, CTR, and Order WQO 2008-0008, the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness was used to adjust the criterion. In this evaluation the portion of the receiving water affected by the discharge is analyzed. For hardness-dependent criteria, the hardness of the effluent has an impact on the determination of the applicable criterion

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

² The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO₃), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used. It further requires that the hardness values used must be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones.

in areas in the receiving water affected by the discharge. Therefore, for this situation it is necessary to consider the hardness of the effluent in determining the applicable hardness to adjust the criterion. The procedures for determining the applicable criterion after proper adjustment using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness is outlined in subsection ii, below.

- For comparing the Maximum Ambient Background Concentration to the applicable criterion, in accordance with the SIP, CTR, and Order WQO 2008-0008, the reasonable worst-case upstream hardness was used to adjust the criterion. In this evaluation the area outside the influence of the discharge is analyzed. For this situation, the discharge does not impact the upstream hardness. Therefore, the effect of the effluent hardness was not included in this evaluation.

The procedures for determining the applicable criterion after proper adjustment using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness is outlined in subsection ii. below.

- ii. **Calculation of Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs).** The remaining discussion in this section relates to the development of water quality-based effluent limits when it has been determined that the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR hardness-dependent metals criteria in the receiving water.

The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR, is as follows:

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

Where:

H = hardness (as CaCO₃)

WER = water-effect ratio

m, b = metal- and criterion-specific constants

In accordance with the CTR, the default value for the WER is 1. A WER study must be conducted to use a value other than 1. The constants “m” and “b” are specific to both the metal under consideration, and the type of total recoverable criterion (i.e., acute or chronic). The metal-specific values for these constants are provided in the CTR at paragraph (b)(2), Table 1.

The equation for the ECA is defined in Section 1.4, Step 2, of the SIP and is as follows:

$$\text{ECA} = C \quad (\text{when } C \leq B)^1 \quad (\text{Equation 2})$$

¹ The 2006 Study assumes the ambient background metals concentration is equal to the CTR criterion (i.e. C ≤ B)

Where:

- C = the priority pollutant criterion/objective, adjusted for hardness (see Equation 1, above)
- B = the ambient background concentration

The effluent hardness ranged from 71 mg/L to 74 mg/L (as CaCO₃), based on 2 samples, both collected 25 March 2009. The upstream receiving water hardness in the Sacramento River was 50 mg/L (as CaCO₃), based on 1 sample collected on 25 March 2009 (these data represent the only hardness data collected by the Discharger during the current permit cycle).

Order No. R5-2005-0015 did not require the Discharger to collect effluent and receiving water samples for laboratory analysis of hardness. As such, only one sample from both the effluent and receiving water was analyzed for hardness as part of the required priority pollutant scan on 25 March 2009. As mentioned the upstream receiving water hardness in the Sacramento River was 50 mg/L. Effluent hardness on 25 March 2010 was 74 mg/L. Relying on one sample as being representative of the lowest receiving water hardness is inappropriate.

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) regularly collects water quality data upstream and downstream of the Facility's discharge at Balls Ferry Bridge (upstream) and Bend Bridge (downstream). The lowest hardness at the Bend Bridge (downstream) is 46 mg/L, based on 43 samples collected between 10 January 2005 and 1 February 2010. Cottonwood Creek is tributary to the Sacramento River, the confluence of which is located below the Balls Ferry Bridge and upstream of the Facility's discharge. Cottonwood Creek's unique flow regime provides for localized alteration of water chemistry in the vicinity of the Discharger's upstream receiving water sample location. As such, the lowest mixed hardness values representative of "ambient conditions" are based on DWR's Bend Bridge sample data. Thus, for comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, in accordance with the SIP, CTR, and Order WQO 2008-0008, the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness (46 mg/L as CaCO₃) was used to adjust the criterion. This reasonable worst-case downstream hardness was also used to determine the appropriate effluent concentration allowance (ECA) for purposes of calculating effluent limits for hardness dependant metals.

This approach of using actual observed downstream hardness for calculating hardness dependent metals criteria differs from the "Concave Up/Concave Down" approach described in other recent Central Valley Water Board NPDES permits. This different approach is warranted because of the limited upstream and effluent hardness data, and because the DWR data is available and representative of mixed downstream hardness. This approach is

conservative because the lowest hardness value at Bend Bridge (downstream) is lower than the available upstream and effluent data.

- iii **Conversion Factors.** The CTR contains aquatic life criteria for arsenic, cadmium, chromium III, chromium VI, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc which are presented in dissolved concentrations. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The default USEPA conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 of the SIP were used to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria.

d. Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone – Not Applicable

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

- a. 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.¹ 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 based on information submitted as part of the application, in studies, and as directed by monitoring and reporting programs.
- b. **Constituents with Limited Data.** Reasonable potential cannot be adequately determined for the following constituents because effluent data are limited or ambient background concentrations are not available. The Discharger is required to continue to monitor for these constituents in the effluent using analytical methods that provide the best feasible detection limits. When additional data become available, further analysis will be conducted to determine whether to add numeric effluent limitations or to continue monitoring.
 - i. **Copper.** Three effluent samples have been analyzed for copper. These samples were collected in February and November 2001 and March 2009 and result in a maximum concentration of 3.1 ug/L (25 March 2009). Using a hardness of 46 mg/L as as CaCO₃ the lowest criterion is 3.5 ug/L. The two 9-year old and one recent data points do not indicate that reasonable potential exists, but are inadequate for a proper reasonable potential analysis. Additional monitoring has been established for copper. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, then this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

¹ See Order WQO 2001-16 (Napa) and Order WQO 2004-0013 (Yuba City).

- ii. **Alpha-BHC.** Three effluent samples have been analyzed for Alpha-Benzene Hexachloride (Alpha-BHC). These samples were collected in February and November 2001 and March 2009 and result in a maximum estimated (J-Flag) concentration of 0.007 ug/L (25 March 2009). The lowest criterion is 0.0039. The two 9-year old and one recent data point are inadequate for a proper reasonable potential analysis. Therefore, the Regional Water Board is not establishing effluent limitations at this time. Instead, of limitations, additional monitoring has been established for Alpha-BHC. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, then this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.
 - iii. **Ammonia.** One effluent sample has been analyzed for ammonia during the most recent permit cycle. This sample was collected on 25 March 2009 and resulted in a concentration of 1.92 mg/L (as N). Using the maximum pH criterion and considering the presence of Salmonids in the receiving water, water quality objectives for ammonia result in the following; continuous maximum concentration of 2.14 mg/L, criterion continuous concentration of 2.02 mg/L, and a 4-day average criterion of 5.05 mg/L. The single data point does not indicate reasonable potential, but is inadequate for a proper reasonable potential analysis. Therefore additional monitoring has been established for ammonia. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, then this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.
- c. Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** WQBELs are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential; however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.
- d. Constituents with Reasonable Potential.** 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 pH, pathogens, zinc, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane. WQBELs for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.
- i. **Chlorodibromomethane**
 - (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.401 µg/L for chlorodibromomethane for the protection of human health for water from which both water and organisms are consumed.

- (b) RPA Results.** The maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for chlorodibromomethane was 1.5 µg/L. Therefore, chlorodibromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (c) WQBELs.** Assimilative capacity for chlorodibromomethane likely exists in the Sacramento River, however the Discharger has not provided evidence or studies to support the applicability of dilution credit to the subject discharge. As such dilution credit has not been granted for chlorodibromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for chlorodibromomethane of 0.40 µg/L and 0.80 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (d) Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data suggests the Discharger may not be able to comply with effluent limits for chlorodibromomethane established in this Order. The Regional Water Board may consider a compliance schedule under separate Order to allow the Discharger time to comply with final effluent limits.
- ii. Dichlorobromomethane**
- (a) WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.56 µg/L for dichlorobromomethane for the protection of human health for water from which both water and organisms are consumed.
- (b) RPA Results.** The maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for dichlorobromomethane was 10.2 µg/L. Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (c) WQBELs.** Assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane likely exists in the Sacramento River, however the Discharger has not provided evidence or studies to support the applicability of dilution credit to the subject discharge. As such dilution credit has not been granted for dichlorobromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for dichlorobromomethane of 0.56 µg/L and 1.12 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (d) Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data suggests the Discharger may not be able to comply with effluent limits for dichlorobromomethane established in this Order. The Regional Water Board may consider a compliance schedule under separate Order to allow the Discharger time to comply with final effluent limits.

iii. Zinc

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR and Basin Plan include hardness dependent criteria and objectives for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. Using the default conversion factors and reasonable worst-case measured hardness, as described in section IV.C.2.c of this Fact Sheet, the applicable acute (1-hour average) criterion is 18.38 µg/L and the applicable chronic (4-day average) criterion is 62.05 µg/L., as total recoverable.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for zinc was 37.6 µg/L (as total recoverable) while the maximum observed upstream receiving water concentration was 40 µg/L (as total recoverable). Therefore, zinc in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion and Basin Plan objective for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- (c) **WQBELs.** Data presented by the Discharger to date suggests no assimilative capacity in the immediate vicinity of the outfall. However, a review of water quality data obtained from the California Department of Water Resource's Water Data Library collected at the Balls Ferry Bridge, approximately seven miles upstream from the subject discharge, indicates assimilative capacity may exist. The Discharger has not provided evidence that dilution credits are applicable to this discharge and as such no dilution was granted in the development of the effluent limits. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) of 9.16 ug/L and a maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) of 18.38 ug/L for zinc, as shown in Table F-13 of this Fact Sheet, based on the CTR criterion and Basin Plan objective for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data suggests the Discharger may not be able to comply with effluent limits for zinc established in this Order. The Regional Water Board may consider a compliance schedule under separate Order to allow the Discharger time to comply with final effluent limits.

iv. Chlorine Residual

- (a) **WQO.** USEPA developed NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. The Discharger uses a sodium bisulfite process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to the

Sacramento River. 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 NAWQC.

(c) WQBELs. The USEPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control* [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-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 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively, based on USEPA's NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.

(d) Plant Performance and Attainability. The Discharger can immediately comply with the chlorine residual effluent limitations.

v. Pathogens

The Regional Water Board, when developing NPDES permits, implements recommendations by DPH for the appropriate disinfection requirements for the protection of MUN, REC-1 and AGR. The disinfection requirements in the proposed Order implement the DPH recommendations and are fully protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

(a) WQO. In 1987, the Department of Health Services (DHS) (now the Department of Public Health, or DPH) issued the "Uniform Guidelines for the Disinfection of Wastewater" (Uniform Guidelines), which included recommendations to the Regional Water Board regarding the appropriate level of disinfection for wastewater discharges to surface waters. In a letter to the Regional Water Board dated 8 April 1999, DPH indicated it would consider wastewater discharged to water bodies with identified beneficial uses of irrigation or contact recreation and where the wastewater receives dilution of more than 20:1 to be adequately disinfected if the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and if the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 240 MPN/100 mL more than once in any 30-day period. In a subsequent letter dated 1 July 2003, DPH states that *a filtered and disinfected effluent should be required in situations where critical beneficial uses (i.e. food crop irrigation or body contact recreation) are made of the receiving waters unless a 20:1 dilution ratio is available. In these circumstances, a secondary, 23 MPN discharge is acceptable.* DPH considers such discharges to be essentially pathogen-free.

There are no numeric water quality objectives for pathogens applicable to the receiving water for the protection of MUN. The applicable narrative water quality objective that applies to surface waters is the bacteria objective in the Basin Plan, which states, *“In waters 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.”*

- (b) RPA Results.** Municipal and domestic supply and body contact water recreation are beneficial uses of the Sacramento River. As a municipal wastewater treatment plant, effluent has the potential to contain pathogens which exceed DPH recommendations and Basin Plan Objectives if improperly disinfected. This Order contains WQBELs for pathogens.
- (c) WQBELs.** This Order includes a 500 MPN/100mL daily maximum effluent coliform limit, 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and 240 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period. These coliform limits are imposed to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water, including public health through contact recreation and drinking water pathways.
- (d) Plant Performance and Attainability.** The previous Order did not contain the 240 MPN/100mL limit. The change in the limit is appropriate to implement the DPH guidance and ensure protection of applicable beneficial uses. Analysis of the effluent data shows that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

vi. **pH**

- (a) WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the *“...pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.”*
- (b) RPA Results.** The discharge of secondary treated wastewater has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the Basin Plan’s numeric objectives for pH.
- (c) WQBELs.** Effluent limitations for pH of 6.5 as an instantaneous minimum and 8.5 as an instantaneous maximum are included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan objectives for pH.
- (d) Plant Performance and Attainability.** The previous Order contained an effluent limit for pH of 6.0 to 9.0. The change in the limit is necessary to ensure protection of the Basin Plan objectives for pH. Analysis of the effluent data shows that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

vii. Salinity

(a) WQO. There are no USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic organisms for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. These data are summarized in Table F-8 along with effluent data collected on 25 March 2009. No other samples were collected under Order No. R5-2005-0015.

Table F-8. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Goal ¹	Secondary MCL ³	Basin Plan	Effluent ⁵	
				Average	Maximum
EC (µmhos/cm)	Varies ²	900, 1600, 2200	230/235 ⁴	--	473
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	--	--	327
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	--	--	29.1
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	--	--	47.7

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 µmhos/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.

⁴ Shall not exceed 230 micromhos/cm (50th percentile) or 235 micromhos/cm (90th percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain at 25 degrees Celsius based on previous 10 years of record.

⁵ Only one sample exists for each of the salinity objectives (collected 25 March 2009).

(1) Chloride. The secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum. 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.

(2) Electrical Conductivity. 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 agricultural

water quality goal, that would apply the narrative chemical constituents objective, is 700 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ 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 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ 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. These crops are either currently grown in the area or may be grown in the future. 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.

The Basin Plan water quality objective for EC states, “Electrical Conductivity shall not exceed 230 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ (50 percentile) or 235 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ (90 percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain; or 240 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ (50 percentile) or 340 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ (90 percentile) at I Street Bridge, based upon previous 10 years of record.

- (3) Sulfate.** The secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (4) Total Dissolved Solids.** The secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum. 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.

(b) RPA Results.

- (1) Chloride.** Chloride concentration in the effluent as measured on 25 March 2009 was 47.7 mg/L. No other data is available. This level does not exceed the agricultural water goal. Background

concentrations in receiving water on 25 March 2009 were 3.68 mg/L. No other background data is available.

(2) Electrical Conductivity. A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows an effluent EC concentration of 473 µmhos/cm collected on 25 March 2009. This level does not exceed the agricultural water goal. The background receiving water EC concentration was 133 µmhos/cm on the same date. Based on effluent and receiving water data, the discharge does not cause an exceedance of the Basin Plan objectives.

(3) Sulfate. Sulfate concentrations in the effluent was 29.1 mg/L on 25 March 2009. This concentration does not exceed the secondary MCL. Background concentration in the receiving water was 7.5 mg/L on 25 March 2009. No other data is available.

(4) Total Dissolved Solids. The TDS concentration on 25 March 2009 was 327 mg/L. This level does not exceed the applicable water quality objectives. The background receiving water TDS concentration was 98 mg/L. No other data is available.

(c) WQBELs. Effluent limitations based on the MCL or the Basin Plan would likely require construction and operation of a reverse osmosis treatment plant. The State Water Board, in Water Quality Order 2005-005 (for the City of Manteca), states, "*...the State Board takes official notice [pursuant to Title 23 of California Code of Regulations, Section 648.2] of the fact that operation of a large-scale reverse osmosis treatment plant would result in production of highly saline brine for which an acceptable method of disposal would have to be developed. Consequently, any decision that would require use of reverse osmosis to treat the City's municipal wastewater effluent on a large scale should involve thorough consideration of the expected environmental effects.*" The State Water Board states in that Order, "*Although the ultimate solution to southern Delta salinity problems have not yet been determined, previous actions establish that the State Board intended for permit limitations to play a limited role with respect to achieving compliance with the EC water quality objectives in the southern Delta.*" The State Water Board goes on to say, "*Construction and operation of reverse osmosis facilities to treat discharges...prior to implementation of other measures to reduce the salt load in the southern Delta, would not be a reasonable approach.*"

The Regional Water Board, with cooperation of the State Water Board, has begun the process to develop a new policy for the regulation of salinity in the Central Valley. In a statement issued at the 16 March 2006, Regional Water Board meeting, Board Member Dr. Karl Longley recommended that the Regional Water Board continue to exercise its authority to regulate discharges of salt to minimize salinity increases within the Central Valley. Dr. Longley stated, "*The process of developing new*

salinity control policies does not, therefore, mean that we should stop regulating salt discharges until a salinity Policy is developed. In the meantime, the Board should consider all possible interim approaches to continue controlling and regulating salts in a reasonable manner, and encourage all stakeholder groups that may be affected by the Regional Board's policy to actively participate in policy development."

Based on the relatively low reported salinity, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity. 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.

4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. This Order includes WQBELs for chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc. The general methodology for calculating WQBELs based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.4.b through e, below. See below and Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.
- b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from Section 1.4 of the SIP:

$$\begin{aligned} ECA &= C + D(C - B) && \text{where } C > B, \text{ and} \\ ECA &= C && \text{where } C \leq B \end{aligned}$$

where:

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

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

- c. **Basin Plan Objectives and MCLs.** For WQBELs based on site-specific numeric Basin Plan objectives or MCLs, the effluent limitations are applied directly as the

ECA as either an MDEL, AMEL, or average annual effluent limitations, depending on the averaging period of the objective.

- d. Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** QBELs based on acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria are calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are converted to equivalent long-term averages (i.e. LTA_{acute} and LTA_{chronic}) using statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.
- e. Human Health Criteria.** QBELs based on human health criteria, are also calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are set equal to the AMEL and a statistical multiplier was used to calculate the MDEL.

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

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

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

where:

- mult*_{AMEL} = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL
- mult*_{MDEL} = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL
- M*_A = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to LTA_{acute}
- M*_C = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to LTA_{chronic}

Table F-9. QBEL Calculations for Chlorodibromomethane at Discharge Point D-001

	Human Health
Criteria (µg/L) ¹	0.401
Dilution Credit	0
ECA	0.40
AMEL Multiplier (95th %) ²	1.55
AMEL (µg/L)	0.40
MDEL Multiplier (99th %)	3.11
MDEL (µg/L)	0.80

¹ USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria.

² AMEL = ECA per section 1.4.B, Step 6 of SIP.

³ Assumes sampling frequency of n=4. Uses MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of SIP.

Table F-10. QBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane at Discharge Point D-001

	Human Health
--	--------------

Criteria (µg/L) ¹	0.56
Dilution Credit	0
ECA	0.56
AMEL Multiplier 95th%) ²	1.55
AMEL (µg/L)	0.56
MDEL Multiplier (99th%)	3.11
MDEL (µg/L)	1.12

- ¹ USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria.
- ² AMEL = ECA per section 1.4.B, Step 6 of SIP.
- ³ Assumes sampling frequency of n=4. Uses MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of SIP.

Table F-11. WQBEL Calculations for Zinc at Discharge Point D-001

	Acute	Chronic
Criteria/Objective, total (µg/L) ¹	18.38	62.05
Dilution Credit	0	0
ECA, total recoverable ²	18.38	62.05
ECA Multiplier ³	0.32	0.53
LTA	5.90	32.73
AMEL Multiplier 95th%) ^{4,5}	1.55	⁷
AMEL (µg/L)	9.16	⁷
MDEL Multiplier (99th%) ⁶	3.11	⁷
MDEL (µg/L)	18.38	⁷

- ¹ Aquatic life criteria from CTR and Basin Plan objectives based on the lowest observed downstream hardness of 46 mg/L.
- ² ECA calculated per Section 1.4.B, Step 2 of SIP.
- ³ Acute and chronic ECA multiplier calculated at 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, step 3 of SIP or per sections 5.4.1 and 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- ⁴ Assumes sampling frequency of n<=4 and CV of 0.6.
- ⁵ The probability basis for AMEL is 95th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP or Section 5.5.4 of the TSD
- ⁶ The probability basis for MDEL is 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP of section 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- ⁷ Limitations based on chronic (acute LTA<chronic LTA).

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

Table F-12. Summary of Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
pH	pH units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Zinc, total	µg/L	9.16	--	18.38	--	--
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.40	--	0.80	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	23 ¹	500	--	240 ²

Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L	--	0.011 ³	0.019 ⁴	--	--
-------------------------	------	----	--------------------	--------------------	----	----

- ¹ 7-day median.
- ² Not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period.
- ³ 4-day average.
- ⁴ 1-hour average.

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. The Order also requires the Discharger to implement best management practices to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity.

a. Acute Aquatic Toxicity. The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, “*...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate...*” 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. For chronic toxicity, ambient waters shall not demonstrate a test result of greater than 1 TUc.*" Accordingly, effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in this Order as follows:

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

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

b. Chronic Aquatic Toxicity. The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) Based on chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger on 25 March 2009, the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

No dilution has been granted for the chronic condition. Therefore, chronic toxicity testing results exceeding 1 chronic toxicity unit (TUc) demonstrates the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Accordingly, a narrative effluent limitation for chronic toxicity has been included in this Order.

Numeric chronic WET effluent limitations have not been included in this Order. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region¹ that contained numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petition, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, *"In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits."* The process to revise the SIP is currently underway. Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limits in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the toxicity control provisions in the SIP are under revision it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. Therefore, this Order requires that the Discharger meet best management practices for compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, as allowed under 40 CFR 122.44(k).

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, the Discharger is required to conduct chronic WET testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E section V.). Furthermore, the Special Provision contained at VI.C.2.a. of this Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates a pattern of toxicity exceeding the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE workplan. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to

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

perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if a pattern of effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

D. Final Effluent Limitations

- a. The following table summarizes the final effluent limitations for Discharge Point D-001:

Table F-13. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations for Discharge Point D-001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis ¹
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Conventional Pollutants							
Flow	MGD	0.64	--	--	--	--	--
BOD 5-day @ 20°C	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	CFR
	lbs/day	53 ²	80 ²	160 ²	--	--	CFR
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	CFR
	lbs/day	53 ²	80 ²	160 ²	--	--	CFR
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	23 ³	500	--	240 ⁶	DPH
pH	Units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5	BP
Priority Pollutants							
Zinc, total	µg/L	9.16	--	18.38	--	--	CTR
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.40	--	0.80	--	--	CTR
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--	CTR
Non-Conventional Pollutants							
Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L	--	0.011 ⁴	0.019 ⁵	--	--	NAWQC

¹ CFR – Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 CFR Part 133.
 BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.
 CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP
 NAWQC – Based on USEPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
 DPH – Based on guidance from the California Department of Public Health.

² Based on design flow of 0.64 mgd

³ 7-day median

⁴ 4-day average

⁵ 1-hour average

⁶ Not to exceed more than once in 30 days.

- 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 (*to be sampled at the end of the contact basin*):
- i. 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day maximum;
 - ii. 0.019 mg/L, as a 1-hour average;

1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations

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.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the permitted average daily discharge flow allowed in section IV.A.1.g. of this Order.

2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations

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, 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 zinc, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane as recommended by the TSD for the achievement of water quality standards and for the protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream.

3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the existing Order.

4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy

This Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to the receiving water. Therefore, a complete antidegradation analysis is not necessary. The Order requires compliance with applicable federal technology-based standards and with WQBELs where the discharge could have the reasonable potential to

cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards. The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD, TSS, and pH. The WQBELs consist of restrictions on zinc, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order includes new effluent limitations for zinc, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses.

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 WQBELs were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual WQBELs for priority pollutants are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on 18 May 2000. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to 30 May 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to 30 May 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA" pursuant to 40 CFR 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

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 Water Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains receiving surface water limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for bacteria, biostimulatory substances, color, chemical constituents, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, salinity, suspended sediment, settleable substances, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity.

B. Groundwater

1. The beneficial uses of underlying ground water are municipal and domestic supply, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, and agricultural supply.
2. Basin Plan water quality objectives include narrative objectives for chemical constituents, tastes and odors, and toxicity of groundwater. The toxicity objective requires that 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 states groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect any beneficial use. The tastes and odors objective prohibits taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan also establishes numerical water quality objectives for chemical constituents and radioactivity in ground waters designated as municipal supply. These include, at a minimum, compliance with MCLs in Title 22 of the CCR. The bacteria objective prohibits coliform organisms at or above 2.2 MPN/100 mL. The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that waters do not contain chemical constituents, toxic substances, radionuclides, taste- or odor-producing substances, or bacteria in concentrations that adversely affect municipal or domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial supply or some other beneficial use.

VI. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

40 CFR 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 (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 Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 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., BOD₅ and TSS reduction requirements). The monitoring frequencies for BOD and TSS have changed from monthly in Order No. R5-2005-0015 to weekly. In addition, this Order requires continuous flow monitoring, daily pH monitoring, and monthly specific conductance and total dissolved solids monitoring. This increase in monitoring is required to better evaluate Facility performance.

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 and groundwater.
2. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow, pH, BOD, TSS, and total coliform, have been retained from Order No. R5-2005-0015 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters. Effluent monitoring frequencies for total residual chlorine, total recoverable zinc, acute and chronic toxicity, and priority pollutants have been increased from Order No. R5-2005-0015. In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, the Regional Water Board shall require periodic monitoring for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. Periodic priority pollutant monitoring is also necessary to provide data that would account for changes in the wastewater characterization. Monitoring for priority pollutants is required once during the 3rd year and once during the 4th year of the permit term to provide the data necessary for determining the reasonable potential for those pollutants for which no WQBELs or specific monitoring were established.
3. This Order contains new effluent monitoring requirements for temperature, specific conductance, dissolved oxygen, hardness, total recoverable copper and zinc, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, ammonia, unionized ammonia, nitrate, sulfate, chloride, aluminum, standard minerals, total phosphorus, and oil and grease. Monitoring of these constituents is required to characterize the effluent and determine compliance with applicable water quality objectives or effluent limitations.

4. Monitoring data collected over the existing permit term for settleable solids and bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order No. R5-2005-0015.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Annual 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Testing shall be performed annually following permit adoption 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 contained in the Special Provision contained in section VI.C.5.c. of this Order. Biosolids disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation.

2. Water Supply Monitoring

Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater; this Order requires monitoring for copper, zinc, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and standard minerals on an annual basis.

3. Pond Monitoring

Pond monitoring is required to evaluate the integrity of the ponds and any nuisance conditions.

VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits

in accordance with 40 CFR 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under 40 CFR 122.42.

40 CFR 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. 40 CFR 123.25(a)(12) allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 CFR 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 CFR 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the CWC is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference CWC 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.** This Order may be reopened for modification 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. Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).** This Order may be reopened, and appropriate effluent limitations, or other controls, prescribed, in order to implement any TMDLs.
- d. Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** This Order requires the Discharger to prepare a Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP). This reopener provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for salinity based on review and implementation of the SEMP.
- e. Whole Effluent Toxicity.** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE). This Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation based on that objective.

- f. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating CTR criteria for applicable priority pollutant inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." (Basin Plan at page III-8.00). Based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger on 25 March 2009, the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, this provision requires the Discharger to submit to the Regional Water Board a TRE Workplan 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, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if a pattern of toxicity is demonstrated. In the event a TRE is required a detailed, a detailed TRE Workplan will be required as outlined below in this provision.

Monitoring Trigger. A numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of > 1 TUC (where TUC = $100/\text{NOEC}$) 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 in a six-week period (i.e., one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. Guidance regarding accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation is provided in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991 (TSD). The TSD at page 118 states,

“EPA recommends if toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present at levels above effluent limits more than 20 percent of the time, a TRE should be required.”

Therefore, four accelerated monitoring tests are required in this provision. If no toxicity is demonstrated in the four accelerated tests, then it demonstrates that toxicity is not present at levels above the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time (only 1 of 5 tests are toxic, including the initial test). However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of 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.

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

- Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants, EPA/833-B-99/002, August 1999.
- Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs), EPA/600/2-88/070, April 1989.
- Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures, Second Edition, EPA 600/6-91/003, 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.

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



- b. Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger shall prepare a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the Facility. The plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 1 year of the adoption date of this Order** for the approval by the Executive Officer.
- c. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Study.** An effluent and receiving water monitoring study is required to ensure adequate information is available for the next permit renewal. During the third and fourth year of this permit term, the Discharger is required to conduct annual monitoring of the effluent at EFF-001 and of the receiving water at RSW-001 for all priority pollutants and other constituents of concern as described in Attachment I. Dioxin and furan sampling shall be performed during the third year, as described in Attachment J.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention – Not Applicable.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

- a. Certified Operator Requirement.** The Discharger shall provide certified wastewater treatment plant operators in accordance with regulations adopted by the State Board.
- b.** The operation and maintenance specifications for the wastewater treatment facility are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of surface and groundwater. The specifications included in this Order are retained from Order No. R5-2005-0015. In addition, reporting requirements related to use of the wastewater treatment facility are required to monitor their use and the potential impact on groundwater.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

- a. Pretreatment Requirements – Not applicable.**
- b.** The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on 2 May 2006. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than one mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMPs) and report all sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), among other requirements and prohibitions.

Furthermore, the General Order contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows. Inasmuch that the Discharger's collection system is part of the system that is subject to this Order, certain standard provisions are applicable as specified in Provisions, section VI.C.5. For instance, the 24-hour reporting

requirements in this Order are not included in the General Order. The Discharger must comply with both the General Order and this Order. The Discharger and public agencies that are discharging wastewater into the facility were required to obtain enrollment for regulation under the General Order by 1 December 2006.

6. Other Special Provisions

- a. Ownership Change.** To maintain the accountability of the operation of the Facility, the Discharger is required to notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter if, and when, there is any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Regional Water Board is considering the issuance of WDRs that will serve as an NPDES permit for the Facility. 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 physical posting (posting at city offices, county courthouse or city hall), 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 must be received at the Regional Water Board offices by 5:00 p.m. on 26 August 2010.

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: 22, 23, 24 September 2010
Time: 8:30 a.m.
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 www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley 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 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, 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 (530) 224-4845.

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 Clint Snyder, P.G. at (530) 224-3213.

G.

ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
<i>RPA for Hardness Dependent Metals</i>											
Cadmium	µg/L	0.25	0.25	0.27	1.88	1.32	--	--	0.27	--	No
Chromium (III), Total Recoverable	µg/L	5	1	109.58	919.34	109.58	--	--	--	50	No
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	3.1	3.5	4.80	6.74	4.80	1300	--	--	1000	No
Lead, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.28	0.04	1.18	30.38	1.18	--	--	15.0	15	No
Nickel, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1.4	1.2	27.04	243.24	27.04	610	4600	--	100	No
Silver, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.5	0.5	1.07	1.07	--	--	--	11.76	100	No
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	37.6	40	18.38	62.05	62.05	--	--	18.38	5000	Yes
<i>RPA for Remaining Constituents</i>											
Antimony, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.2	0.1	14.0	--	--	14	4,300	--	6	No
Arsenic, Total Recoverable	µg/L	1.2	1	10.0	340	150	--	--	10	10	No
Beryllium	µg/L	0.5	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	No
Chromium (VI), Total Recoverable	µg/L	5	5	11.00	16.00	11.00	--	--	--	50	No
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.0106	0.0016	0.05	--	--	0.05	0.05	--	2	No
Selenium, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.6	2	5.00	--	5.00	--	--	--	20	No
Thallium	µg/L	1	1	1.70	--	--	1.70	6.30	--	2	No
Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	<0.9	0.9	1.8	--	--	1.8	5.9	--	4	No
Bromoform	µg/L	<0.1	0.1	4.3	--	--	4.3	360	--	80	No
Butylbenzyl Phthalate	µg/L	0.1J	0.2	3000	--	--	3000	5200	--	--	No
Chloroform	µg/L	33.5	0.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	80	No
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	1.5	0.08	0.401	--	--	0.401	34	--	80	Yes
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	10.2	0.01	0.56	--	--	0.56	46	--	80	Yes
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	2J	2J	2700	--	--	2700	12000	--	--	No
alpha-BHC	µg/L	0.007J	0.002	0.0039	--	--	0.0039	0.013	--	--	Maybe ¹
beta-BHC	µg/L	<0.002	0.002	0.014	--	--	0.014	0.046	--	--	--
gamma-BHC	µg/L	<0.002	0.002	0.019	0.95	--	0.019	0.063	--	--	--
delta-BHC	µg/L	<0.002	0.002	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	No
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.92	0.08	2.02	2.14 ²	2.02 ³	--	--	--	--	No
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.84	0.12	10	--	--	--	--	--	10	No
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	473	133	700 ⁴	--	--	--	--	700	900	No

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
-------------	-------	-----	---	---	-----	-----	-------------	-----------	------------	-----	----------------------

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

MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration

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

C = Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)

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

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

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

MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level

NA = Not Available

ND = Non-detect

Footnotes:

- (1) Only one data point available, insufficient information, permit requires increased monitoring.
- (2) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Protection, 1-hour average, Salmonids Present.
- (3) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Protection, 30-day average, Salmonids Present.
- (4) Agricultural water quality objective for protection against salt sensitive crops.

H.

ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBELS

Parameter	Units	Most Stringent Criteria			Dilution Factors			Aquatic Life Calculations									Final Effluent Limitations	
		HH	CMC	CCC	HH	CMC	CCC	ECA Multiplier acute	LTA acute	ECA Multiplier chronic	LTA chronic	Lowest LTA	AMEL Multiplier 95	AMEL	MDEL Multiplier 99	MDEL	Lowest AMEL	Lowest MDEL
Zinc, total recoverable	ug/L	--	18.38	62.05 ²	0	0	0	0.32 ³	5.90	0.53 ^{1,3}	32.73 ¹	5.90	1.55 ³	9.16	3.11 ³	18.38	9.16	18.38
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/L	0.401	--	--	0	0	0	0.32 ³	--	0.53 ³	--	--	1.55 ³	0.40	3.11 ³	0.80	0.40	0.80
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/L	0.56	--	--	0	0	0	0.32 ³	--	0.53 ³	--	--	1.55 ³	0.56	3.11 ³	1.12	0.56	1.12

¹Chronic 4-day.

²Chronic 30-day.

³Based on a coefficient of variation of 0.6

I.
ATTACHMENT I – EFFLUENT AND RECEIVING WATER CHARACTERIZATION STUDY

I. Background. Sections 2.4.1 through 2.4.4 of the SIP provide minimum standards for analyses and reporting. (Copies of the SIP may be obtained from the State Water Resources Control Board, or downloaded from <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/iswp/index.html>). To implement the SIP, effluent and receiving water data are needed for all priority pollutants. Effluent and receiving water pH and hardness are required to evaluate the toxicity of certain priority pollutants (such as heavy metals) where the toxicity of the constituents varies with pH and/or hardness. Section 3 of the SIP prescribes mandatory monitoring of dioxin congeners. In addition to specific requirements of the SIP, the Regional Water Board is requiring the following monitoring:

A. Drinking water constituents. Constituents for which drinking water Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) have been prescribed in the California Code of Regulation are included in the *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition, for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan defines virtually all surface waters within the Central Valley Region as having existing or potential beneficial uses for municipal and domestic supply. The Basin Plan further requires that, at a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the MCLs contained in the California Code of Regulations.

B. Effluent and receiving water temperature. This is both a concern for application of certain temperature-sensitive constituents, such as fluoride, and for compliance with the Basin Plan’s thermal discharge requirements.

C. Effluent and receiving water hardness and pH. These are necessary because several of the CTR constituents are hardness and pH dependent.

D. Dioxin and furan sampling. Section 3 of the SIP has specific requirements for the collection of samples for analysis of dioxin and furan congeners, which are detailed in Attachment J. Pursuant to Section 13267 of the California Water Code, this Order includes a requirement for the Discharger to submit monitoring data for the effluent and receiving water as described in Attachment J. One sample is shall be collected during a wet season and one sample shall be collected during a dry season.

II. Monitoring Requirements.

A. Twice During the Life of the Permit Monitoring. Priority pollutant samples shall be collected from the effluent and upstream receiving water (EFF-001 and RSW-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table I-1 twice during the life of the permit (in the third and fourth year). Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.

B. Concurrent Sampling. Effluent and receiving water sampling shall be performed at approximately the same time, on the same date.

C. Sample type. All effluent samples shall be taken as 24-hour flow proportioned composite samples or other representative approach approved by the Executive Officer (samples taken from the outlet structures of ponds shall be considered adequately composited). All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples.

Table I-1. Priority Pollutants and other Pollutants of Concern

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters		Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted	Suggested Test Methods
			Basis	Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted ¹		
VOLATILE ORGANICS						
28	1,1-Dichloroethane	75343	Primary MCL	5	0.5	EPA 8260B
30	1,1-Dichloroethene	75354	National Toxics Rule	0.057	0.5	EPA 8260B
41	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71556	Primary MCL	200	0.5	EPA 8260B
42	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	79005	National Toxics Rule	0.6	0.5	EPA 8260B
37	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	79345	National Toxics Rule	0.17	0.5	EPA 8260B
75	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	95501	Taste & Odor	10	0.5	EPA 8260B
29	1,2-Dichloroethane	107062	National Toxics Rule	0.38	0.5	EPA 8260B
	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	156592	Primary MCL	6	0.5	EPA 8260B
31	1,2-Dichloropropane	78875	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.52	0.5	EPA 8260B
101	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120821	Public Health Goal	5	0.5	EPA 8260B
76	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	541731	Taste & Odor	10	0.5	EPA 8260B
32	1,3-Dichloropropene	542756	Primary MCL	0.5	0.5	EPA 8260B
77	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	106467	Primary MCL	5	0.5	EPA 8260B
17	Acrolein	107028	Aquatic Toxicity	21	2	EPA 8260B
18	Acrylonitrile	107131	National Toxics Rule	0.059	2	EPA 8260B
19	Benzene	71432	Primary MCL	1	0.5	EPA 8260B
20	Bromoform	75252	Calif. Toxics Rule	4.3	0.5	EPA 8260B
34	Bromomethane	74839	Calif. Toxics Rule	48	1	EPA 8260B
21	Carbon tetrachloride	56235	National Toxics Rule	0.25	0.5	EPA 8260B
22	Chlorobenzene (mono chlorobenzene)	108907	Taste & Odor	50	0.5	EPA 8260B
24	Chloroethane	75003	Taste & Odor	16	0.5	EPA 8260B
25	2- Chloroethyl vinyl ether	110758	Aquatic Toxicity	122 (3)	1	EPA 8260B
26	Chloroform	67663	OEHHA Cancer Risk	1.1	0.5	EPA 8260B
35	Chloromethane	74873	USEPA Health Advisory	3	0.5	EPA 8260B
23	Dibromochloromethane	124481	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.41	0.5	EPA 8260B
27	Dichlorobromomethane	75274	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.56	0.5	EPA 8260B
36	Dichloromethane	75092	Calif. Toxics Rule	4.7	0.5	EPA 8260B
33	Ethylbenzene	100414	Taste & Odor	29	0.5	EPA 8260B
88	Hexachlorobenzene	118741	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00075	1	EPA 8260B

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters		Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted	Suggested Test Methods
			Basis	Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted ¹		
89	Hexachlorobutadiene	87683	National Toxics Rule	0.44	1	EPA 8260B
91	Hexachloroethane	67721	National Toxics Rule	1.9	1	EPA 8260B
94	Naphthalene	91203	USEPA IRIS	14	10	EPA 8260B
38	Tetrachloroethene	127184	National Toxics Rule	0.8	0.5	EPA 8260B
39	Toluene	108883	Taste & Odor	42	0.5	EPA 8260B
40	trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	156605	Primary MCL	10	0.5	EPA 8260B
43	Trichloroethene	79016	National Toxics Rule	2.7	0.5	EPA 8260B
44	Vinyl chloride	75014	Primary MCL	0.5	0.5	EPA 8260B
	Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	1634044	Secondary MCL	5	0.5	EPA 8260B
	Trichlorofluoromethane	75694	Primary MCL	150	5	EPA 8260B
	1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-Trifluoroethane	76131	Primary MCL	1200	10	EPA 8260B
	Styrene	100425	Taste & Odor	11	0.5	EPA 8260B
	Xylenes	1330207	Taste & Odor	17	0.5	EPA 8260B
SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS						
60	1,2-Benzanthracene	56553	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0044	5	EPA 8270C
85	1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	122667	National Toxics Rule	0.04	1	EPA 8270C
45	2-Chlorophenol	95578	Taste and Odor	0.1	2	EPA 8270C
46	2,4-Dichlorophenol	120832	Taste and Odor	0.3	1	EPA 8270C
47	2,4-Dimethylphenol	105679	Calif. Toxics Rule	540	2	EPA 8270C
49	2,4-Dinitrophenol	51285	National Toxics Rule	70	5	EPA 8270C
82	2,4-Dinitrotoluene	121142	National Toxics Rule	0.11	5	EPA 8270C
55	2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	88062	Taste and Odor	2	10	EPA 8270C
83	2,6-Dinitrotoluene	606202	USEPA IRIS	0.05	5	EPA 8270C
50	2-Nitrophenol	25154557	Aquatic Toxicity	150 (5)	10	EPA 8270C
71	2-Chloronaphthalene	91587	Aquatic Toxicity	1600 (6)	10	EPA 8270C
78	3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	91941	National Toxics Rule	0.04	5	EPA 8270C
62	3,4-Benzofluoranthene	205992	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0044	10	EPA 8270C
52	4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	59507	Aquatic Toxicity	30	5	EPA 8270C
48	4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	534521	National Toxics Rule	13.4	10	EPA 8270C
51	4-Nitrophenol	100027	USEPA Health Advisory	60	5	EPA 8270C
69	4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	101553	Aquatic Toxicity	122	10	EPA 8270C
72	4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	7005723	Aquatic Toxicity	122 (3)	5	EPA 8270C
56	Acenaphthene	83329	Taste and Odor	20	1	EPA 8270C
57	Acenaphthylene	208968	No Criteria Available		10	EPA 8270C
58	Anthracene	120127	Calif. Toxics Rule	9,600	10	EPA 8270C
59	Benzidine	92875	National Toxics Rule	0.00012	5	EPA 8270C

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters		Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted	Suggested Test Methods
			Basis	Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted ¹		
61	Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)	50328	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0044	0.1	EPA 8270C
63	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	191242	No Criteria Available		5	EPA 8270C
64	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	207089	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0044	2	EPA 8270C
65	Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	111911	No Criteria Available		5	EPA 8270C
66	Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	111444	National Toxics Rule	0.031	1	EPA 8270C
67	Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	39638329	Aquatic Toxicity	122 (3)	10	EPA 8270C
68	Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	117817	National Toxics Rule	1.8	3	EPA 8270C
70	Butyl benzyl phthalate	85687	Aquatic Toxicity	3 (7)	10	EPA 8270C
73	Chrysene	218019	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0044	5	EPA 8270C
81	Di-n-butylphthalate	84742	Aquatic Toxicity	3 (7)	10	EPA 8270C
84	Di-n-octylphthalate	117840	Aquatic Toxicity	3 (7)	10	EPA 8270C
74	Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene	53703	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0044	0.1	EPA 8270C
79	Diethyl phthalate	84662	Aquatic Toxicity	3 (7)	2	EPA 8270C
80	Dimethyl phthalate	131113	Aquatic Toxicity	3 (7)	2	EPA 8270C
86	Fluoranthene	206440	Calif. Toxics Rule	300	10	EPA 8270C
87	Fluorene	86737	Calif. Toxics Rule	1300	10	EPA 8270C
90	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	77474	Taste and Odor	1	1	EPA 8270C
92	Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	193395	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0044	0.05	EPA 8270C
93	Isophorone	78591	National Toxics Rule	8.4	1	EPA 8270C
98	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	86306	National Toxics Rule	5	1	EPA 8270C
96	N-Nitrosodimethylamine	62759	National Toxics Rule	0.00069	5	EPA 8270C
97	N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	621647	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.005	5	EPA 8270C
95	Nitrobenzene	98953	National Toxics Rule	17	10	EPA 8270C
53	Pentachlorophenol	87865	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.28	0.2	EPA 8270C
99	Phenanthrene	85018	No Criteria Available		5	EPA 8270C
54	Phenol	108952	Taste and Odor	5	1	EPA 8270C
100	Pyrene	129000	Calif. Toxics Rule	960	10	EPA 8270C
INORGANICS						
	Aluminum	7429905	Ambient Water Quality	87	50	EPA 6020/200.8
1	Antimony	7440360	Primary MCL	6	5	EPA 6020/200.8
2	Arsenic	7440382	Ambient Water Quality	0.018	0.01	EPA 1632
15	Asbestos	1332214	National Toxics Rule/ Primary MCL	7 MFL	0.2 MFL >10um	EPA/600/R-93/116(PCM)
	Barium	7440393	Basin Plan Objective	100	100	EPA 6020/200.8
3	Beryllium	7440417	Primary MCL	4	1	EPA 6020/200.8
4	Cadmium	7440439	Public Health Goal	0.07	0.25	EPA 1638/200.8
5a	Chromium (total)	7440473	Primary MCL	50	2	EPA 6020/200.8

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters		Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted	Suggested Test Methods
			Basis	Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted ¹		
5b	Chromium (VI)	18540299	Public Health Goal	0.2	0.5	EPA 7199/1636
6	Copper	7440508	National Toxics Rule	4.1 (2)	0.5	EPA 6020/200.8
14	Cyanide	57125	National Toxics Rule	5.2	5	EPA 9012A
	Fluoride	7782414	Public Health Goal	1000	0.1	EPA 300
	Iron	7439896	Secondary MCL	300	100	EPA 6020/200.8
7	Lead	7439921	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.92 (2)	0.5	EPA 1638
8	Mercury	7439976	TMDL Development		0.0002 (11)	EPA 1669/1631
	Manganese	7439965	Secondary MCL/ Basin Plan Objective	50	20	EPA 6020/200.8
9	Nickel	7440020	Calif. Toxics Rule	24 (2)	5	EPA 6020/200.8
10	Selenium	7782492	Calif. Toxics Rule	5 (8)	5	EPA 6020/200.8
11	Silver	7440224	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.71 (2)	1	EPA 6020/200.8
12	Thallium	7440280	National Toxics Rule	1.7	1	EPA 6020/200.8
	Tributyltin	688733	Ambient Water Quality	0.063	0.002	EV-024/025
13	Zinc	7440666	Calif. Toxics Rule/ Basin Plan Objective	54/ 16 (2)	10	EPA 6020/200.8
PESTICIDES - PCBs						
110	4,4'-DDD	72548	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00083	0.02	EPA 8081A
109	4,4'-DDE	72559	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00059	0.01	EPA 8081A
108	4,4'-DDT	50293	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00059	0.01	EPA 8081A
112	alpha-Endosulfan	959988	National Toxics Rule	0.056 (9)	0.02	EPA 8081A
103	alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)	319846	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0039	0.01	EPA 8081A
	Alachlor	15972608	Primary MCL	2	1	EPA 8081A
102	Aldrin	309002	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00013	0.005	EPA 8081A
113	beta-Endosulfan	33213659	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.056 (9)	0.01	EPA 8081A
104	beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	319857	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.014	0.005	EPA 8081A
107	Chlordane	57749	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00057	0.1	EPA 8081A
106	delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	319868	No Criteria Available		0.005	EPA 8081A
111	Dieldrin	60571	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00014	0.01	EPA 8081A
114	Endosulfan sulfate	1031078	Ambient Water Quality	0.056	0.05	EPA 8081A
115	Endrin	72208	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.036	0.01	EPA 8081A
116	Endrin Aldehyde	7421934	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.76	0.01	EPA 8081A
117	Heptachlor	76448	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00021	0.01	EPA 8081A
118	Heptachlor Epoxide	1024573	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0001	0.01	EPA 8081A
105	Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)	58899	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.019	0.019	EPA 8081A
119	PCB-1016	12674112	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00017 (10)	0.5	EPA 8082
120	PCB-1221	11104282	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00017 (10)	0.5	EPA 8082

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters		Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted	Suggested Test Methods
			Basis	Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted ¹		
121	PCB-1232	11141165	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00017 (10)	0.5	EPA 8082
122	PCB-1242	53469219	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00017 (10)	0.5	EPA 8082
123	PCB-1248	12672296	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00017 (10)	0.5	EPA 8082
124	PCB-1254	11097691	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00017 (10)	0.5	EPA 8082
125	PCB-1260	11096825	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.00017 (10)	0.5	EPA 8082
126	Toxaphene	8001352	Calif. Toxics Rule	0.0002	0.5	EPA 8081A
	Atrazine	1912249	Public Health Goal	0.15	1	EPA 8141A
	Bentazon	25057890	Primary MCL	18	2	EPA 643/ 515.2
	Carbofuran	1563662	CDFG Hazard Assess.	0.5	5	EPA 8318
	2,4-D	94757	Primary MCL	70	10	EPA 8151A
	Dalapon	75990	Ambient Water Quality	110	10	EPA 8151A
	1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	96128	Public Health Goal	0.0017	0.01	EPA 8260B
	Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	103231	USEPA IRIS	30	5	EPA 8270C
	Dinoseb	88857	Primary MCL	7	2	EPA 8151A
	Diquat	85007	Ambient Water Quality	0.5	4	EPA 8340/ 549.1/HPLC
	Endothal	145733	Primary MCL	100	45	EPA 548.1
	Ethylene Dibromide	106934	OEHHA Cancer Risk	0.0097	0.02	EPA 8260B/504
	Glyphosate	1071836	Primary MCL	700	25	HPLC/EPA 547
	Methoxychlor	72435	Public Health Goal	30	10	EPA 8081A
	Molinate (Ordram)	2212671	CDFG Hazard Assess.	13	2	EPA 634
	Oxamyl	23135220	Public Health Goal	50	20	EPA 8318/632
	Picloram	1918021	Primary MCL	500	1	EPA 8151A
	Simazine (Princep)	122349	USEPA IRIS	3.4	1	EPA 8141A
	Thiobencarb	28249776	Basin Plan Objective/ Secondary MCL	1	1	HPLC/EPA 639
16	2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	1746016	Calif. Toxics Rule	1.30E-08	5.00E-06	EPA 8290 (HRGC) MS
	2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	93765	Ambient Water Quality	10	1	EPA 8151A
	Diazinon	333415	CDFG Hazard Assess.	0.05	0.25	EPA 8141A/GCMS
	Chlorpyrifos	2921882	CDFG Hazard Assess.	0.014	1	EPA 8141A/GCMS
OTHER CONSTITUENTS						
	Ammonia (as N)	7664417	Ambient Water Quality	1500 (4)		EPA 350.1
	Chloride	16887006	Agricultural Use	106,000		EPA 300.0
	Flow			1 CFS		
	Hardness (as CaCO ₃)			5000		EPA 130.2
	Foaming Agents (MBAS)		Secondary MCL	500		SM5540C
	Nitrate (as N)	14797558	Primary MCL	10,000	2,000	EPA 300.0

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters		Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted	Suggested Test Methods
			Basis	Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted ¹		
	Nitrite (as N)	14797650	Primary MCL	1000	400	EPA 300.0
	pH		Basin Plan Objective	6.5-8.5	0.1	EPA 150.1
	Phosphorus, Total (as P)	7723140	USEPA IRIS	0.14		EPA 365.3
	Specific conductance (EC)		Agricultural Use	700 umhos/cm		EPA 120.1
	Sulfate		Secondary MCL	250,000	500	EPA 300.0
	Sulfide (as S)		Taste and Odor	0.029		EPA 376.2
	Sulfite (as SO ₃)		No Criteria Available			SM4500-SO3
	Temperature		Basin Plan Objective	°F		
	Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)		Agricultural Use	450,000		EPA 160.1

FOOTNOTES:

- (1) - The Criterion Concentrations serve only as a point of reference for the selection of the appropriate analytical method. They do not indicate a regulatory decision that the cited concentration is either necessary or sufficient for full protection of beneficial uses. Available technology may require that effluent limits be set lower than these values.
- (2) - Freshwater aquatic life criteria for metals are expressed as a function of total hardness (mg/L) in the water body. Values displayed correspond to a total hardness of 40 mg/L.
- (3) - For haloethers
- (4) - Freshwater aquatic life criteria for ammonia are expressed as a function of pH and temperature of the water body. Values displayed correspond to pH 8.0 and temperature of 22°C.
- (5) - For nitrophenols.
- (6) - For chlorinated naphthalenes.
- (7) - For phthalate esters.
- (8) - Basin Plan objective = 2 ug/L for Salt Slough and specific constructed channels in the Grassland watershed.
- (9) - Criteria for sum of alpha- and beta- forms.
- (10) - Criteria for sum of all PCBs.
- (11) - Mercury monitoring shall utilize "ultra-clean" sampling and analytical methods. These methods include:
 - Method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at USEPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, USEPA; and
 - Method 1631: Mercury in Water by Oxidation, Purge and Trap, and Cold Vapor Atomic Fluorescence, USEPA

III. Additional Study Requirements

A. Laboratory Requirements. The laboratory analyzing the monitoring samples shall be certified by the Department of Health Services in accordance with the provisions of Water Code 13176 and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports (ELAP certified). 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.

B. Criterion Quantitation Limit (CQL). The criterion quantitation limits will be equal to or lower than the minimum levels (MLs) in Appendix 4 of the SIP or the detection limits for purposes of reporting (DLRs) below the controlling water quality criterion concentrations summarized in Table I-1 of this Order. In cases where the controlling water quality criteria concentrations are below the detection limits of all approved analytical methods, the best available procedure will be utilized that meets the lowest of the MLs and DLR. Table I-1 contains suggested analytical procedures. The Discharger is not required to use these specific procedures as long as the procedure selected achieves the desired minimum detection level.

C. Method Detection Limit (MDL). The method detection limit for the laboratory shall be determined by the procedure found in 40 CFR Part 136, Appendix B (revised as of May 14, 1999).

D. Reporting Limit (RL). The reporting limit for the laboratory. This is the lowest quantifiable concentration that the laboratory can determine. Ideally, the RL should be equal to or lower than the CQL to meet the purposes of this monitoring.

E. Reporting Protocols. The results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample shall use the following reporting protocols:

1. Sample results greater than or equal to the reported RL shall be reported as measured by the laboratory (i.e., the measured chemical concentration in the sample).
2. Sample results less than the reported 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.
3. 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 shortened to "Est. Conc."). The laboratory, if such information is available, may include numerical estimates of the data quantity for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy (+ or – a percentage of the reported value), numerical ranges (low and high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.
4. Sample results that are less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected" or ND.

F. Data Format. The monitoring report shall contain the following information for each pollutant:

1. The name of the constituent.
2. Sampling location.
3. The date the sample was collected.
4. The time the sample was collected.
5. The date the sample was analyzed. For organic analyses, the extraction data will also be indicated to assure that hold times are not exceeded for prepared samples.
6. The analytical method utilized.
7. The measured or estimated concentration.
8. The required Criterion Quantitation Limit (CQL).
9. The laboratory's current Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure found in 40 CFR Part 136, Appendix B (revised as of May 14, 1999).
10. The laboratory's lowest reporting limit (RL).
11. Any additional comments.

J.

ATTACHMENT J – DIOXIN AND FURAN SAMPLING

The CTR includes criteria for 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-pdioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD). In addition to this compound, there are many congeners of chlorinated dibenzodioxins (2,3,7,8-CDDs) and chlorinated dibenzofurans (2,3,7,8-CDFs) that exhibit toxic effects similar to those of 2,3,7,8-TCDD. The USEPA has published toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for 17 of the congeners. The TEFs express the relative toxicities of the congeners compared to 2,3,7,8-TCDD (whose TEF equals 1.0). In June 1997, participants in a World Health Organization (WHO) expert meeting revised TEF values for 1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDD, OctaCDD, and OctaCDF. The current TEFs for the 17 congeners, which include the three revised values, are shown below:

Toxic Equivalency Factors (TEFs) for 2,3,7,8-TCDD Equivalents

Congener	TEF
2,3,7,8-TetraCDD	1
1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDD	1.0
1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDD	0.1
1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDD	0.1
1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDD	0.1
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDD	0.01
OctaCDD	0.0001
2,3,7,8-TetraCDF	0.1
1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDF	0.05
2,3,4,7,8-PentaCDF	0.5
1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDF	0.1
1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDF	0.1
1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDF	0.1
2,3,4,6,7,8-HexaCDF	0.1
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDF	0.01
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HeptaCDF	0.01
OctaCDF	0.0001

The Discharger shall conduct effluent and receiving water monitoring for the 2,3,7,8-TCDD congeners listed above to assess the presence and amounts of the congeners being discharged and already present in the receiving water. Effluent and upstream receiving water shall be monitored for the presence of the 17 congeners **once during dry weather and once during wet weather, during the third year of the permit.**

The Discharger shall report, for each congener, the analytical results of the effluent and receiving water monitoring, including the quantifiable limit and the method detection limit, and the measured or estimated concentration.

In addition, the Discharger shall multiply each measured or estimated congener concentration by its respective TEF value and report the sum of these values.