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. R5-2008-XXXX
NPDES NO. CA0077933

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CITY OF WILLIAMS WILLIAMS WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT COLUSA COUNTY

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	City of Williams
Name of Facility	Williams Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	700 B Street
	Williams, CA 95987
	Colusa County
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have classified this discharge as a minor discharge.	

The discharge by the City of Williams from the discharge points identified below is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 2. Discharge Location

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Receiving Water
001	Treated Municipal Wastewater	39º, 10', 11" N	-122º, 9', 13" W	Salt Creek

Table 3. Administrative Information

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

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Order No. 5-01-049 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

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

_____

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

TENTATIVE ORDER

Table of Contents

I. Facility Information 5
II. Findings 5
III. Discharge Prohibitions 11
IV. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications 12
A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 12
1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 12
2. Interim Effluent Limitations. 13
B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable 14
C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable 14
V. Receiving Water Limitations 15
A. Surface Water Limitations 15
B. Groundwater Limitations 17
VI. Provisions 17
A. Standard Provisions 17
B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements 21
C. Special Provisions 22
1. Reopener Provisions 22
2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements 23
3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention 26
4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications 26
5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) 27
6. Other Special Provisions 29
7. Compliance Schedules 30
VII. Compliance Determination 31
Standard Mail E-15
FedEx/UPS/ E-15
Other Private Carriers E-15

List of Tables

Table 1. Discharger Information ..... Cover
Table 2. Discharge Location ..... Cover
Table 3. Administrative Information ..... Cover
Table 4. Facility Information 5
Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses 7
Table 6. Effluent Limitations 12
Table 7a. Interim Effluent Limitations 13
Table 7b. Interim Effluent Limitations 14
Table 7c. Interim Effluent Limitations 14

List of Attachments

Attachment A – Definitions A-1
Attachment B – Map B-1
Attachment C – Flow Schematic C-1

TENTATIVE ORDER

Attachment D – Standard Provisions D-1
Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet F-1

TENTATIVE ORDER

TENTATIVE ORDER

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

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

Table 4. Facility Information

Discharger	City of Williams
Name of Facility	Williams Wastewater Treatment Plant, Williams
Facility Address	700 B Street
	Williams, CA 95987
	Colusa County
Facility Contact, Title, and Phone	Wes Goforth, Director of Public Services, (530) 473-5389
Mailing Address	P.O. Box 310, Williams, CA 95987
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
Facility Design Flow	0.5 million gallons per day

II. FINDINGS

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

A. Background. The City of Williams (hereinafter Discharger) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. 5-01-049 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0077933. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 10 October 2005, and applied for an NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to 0.75 million gallons per day (mgd) of treated wastewater from Williams Wastewater Treatment Plant, hereinafter Facility. The facility is currently authorized to discharge up to 0.5 mgd (average dry weather flow).

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

B. Facility Description. The Discharger owns and operates a Publicly Owned treatment Works (POTW). The treatment system consists of headworks with grit removal, unlined aerated waste stabilization ponds, and chlorination/dechlorination. Sludge is occasionally removed from the ponds, dewatered and disposed off-site. Wastewater is discharged from Discharge Point 001 (see table on cover page) to Salt Creek, a water of the United States, and a tributary to Freshwater Creek that flows into Colusa Basin Drain within the Sacramento River Watershed. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

C. Legal Authorities. This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code

(commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters. This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13260).

D. Background and Rationale for Requirements. The Regional Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for Order requirements, is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes part of the Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G are also incorporated into this Order.

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

F. Technology-based Effluent Limitations*.* Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at section 122.44, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)[1] require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. This Order includes technology-based effluent limitations based on tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements that meet both the technology-based secondary treatment standards for POTWs and protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters. A detailed discussion of the technology-based effluent limitations development is included in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F).

G. Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations. Section 301(b) of the CWA and section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC Section 13241 in establishing these requirements. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) mandates that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) must be established using: (1) EPA 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

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed State criterion or policy interpreting the State's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

H. Water Quality Control Plans. The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised August 2006), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. The Basin Plan at page II-2.00 states that the "…*beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams*." The Basin Plan does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Salt Creek, but does identify present and potential uses for Colusa Basin Drain, to which Salt Creek, via Freshwater Creek, is tributary. These beneficial uses are as follows: agricultural supply, including stock watering; water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting; warm and potential cold freshwater habitat; warm migration of aquatic organisms; warm spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; and wildlife habitat.

In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Thus, as discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet, beneficial uses applicable to Salt Creek are as follows:

Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	**Salt Creek to Colusa Basin Drain via Freshwater Creek**	Existing: municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including stock watering (AGR); water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting (REC-1); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); warm migration of aquatic organisms (MGR); warm spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN); wildlife habitat (WILD) Potential: Cold freshwater habitat (COLD) Groundwater: Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN), industrial service supply (IND), industrial process supply (PRO), and agricultural supply (AGR).

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.)."

TENTATIVE ORDER

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." Salt Creek is tributary to the Colusa Basin Drain, which is listed as a WQLS for azinphos-methyl, carbofuran, diazinon, group A pesticides (aldrin, dieldrin, chlordane, endrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, hexachlorocyclohexane (including lindane), endosulfan, and toxaphene), malathion, methyl parathion, molinate/ordram, and unknown toxicity in the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. The Colusa Basin Drain is tributary to the Sacramento River (Knights Landing to the Delta) which is listed as a WQLS for diazinon, mercury, and unknown toxicity. The Sacramento River is tributary to the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta (northern portion), which is listed as a WQLS for chlorpyrifos, DDT, diazinon, electrical conductivity, group A pesticides, mercury, and unknown toxicity in the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. This Order includes monitoring requirements for azinphos-methyl, carbofuran, diazinon, group A pesticides, malathion, methyl parathion, molinate/ordram, chlorpyrifos, and DDT. Effluent Limitations for mercury, electrical conductivity, and toxicity are included in this Order. Requirements of this Order implement the Basin Plan.

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

J. **State Implementation Policy.** On March 2, 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005 that became effective on July 13, 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.

K. **Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements.** In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with Clean Water Act section 301 and with 40 CFR 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board has concluded that where the Regional Water Board's Basin Plan allows for schedules of compliance and the Regional Water Board is newly interpreting a narrative standard, it may include schedules of compliance in the permit to meet effluent limits that implement a narrative standard. See In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements for Avon Refinery (State Board Order WQ 2001-06 at pp. 53-55). See also Communities for Better Environment et al. v. State Water Resources Control

TENTATIVE ORDER

Board, 34 Cal.Rptr.3d 396, 410 (2005). The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers includes a provision that authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES permits for water quality objectives that are adopted after the date of adoption of the Basin Plan, which was September 25, 1995 (See Basin Plan at page IV-16). Consistent with the State Water Board's Order in the CBE matter, the Regional Water Board has the discretion to include compliance schedules in NPDES permits when it is including an effluent limitation that is a "new interpretation" of a narrative water quality objective. This conclusion is also consistent with the United States Environmental Protection Agency policies and administrative decisions. See, e.g., Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy. The Regional Water Board, however, is not required to include a schedule of compliance, but may issue a Time Schedule Order pursuant to Water Code section 13300 or a Cease and Desist Order pursuant to Water Code section 13301 where it finds that the discharger is violating or threatening to violate the permit. The Regional Water Board will consider the merits of each case in determining whether it is appropriate to include a compliance schedule in a permit, and, consistent with the Basin Plan, should consider feasibility of achieving compliance, and must impose a schedule that is as short as practicable to achieve compliance with the objectives, criteria, or effluent limit based on the objective or criteria.

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

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

M. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants. This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD_5 and TSS. The

TENTATIVE ORDER

water quality-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on ammonia, bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, iron, manganese, nitrate, and persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards. These limitations are more stringent than required by the CWA. Specifically, this Order includes effluent limitations for BOD, TSS, turbidity and pathogens that are more stringent than applicable federal standards, but that are nonetheless necessary to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses. The rationale for including these limitations is explained in the Fact Sheet. In addition, the Regional Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant water quality-based effluent limitations were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on May 1, 2001. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "*applicable water quality standards for purposes of the [Clean Water] Act*" pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the technology-based requirements of the CWA and the applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA.

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

O. Anti-Backsliding Requirements. Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at title 40, Code of Federal Regulations section 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

TENTATIVE ORDER

some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order.

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

Q. Standard and Special Provisions. Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42. The Regional Water Board has also included in this Order special provisions applicable to the Discharger. A rationale for the special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the attached Fact Sheet.

R. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law. The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, V.B, and VI.C. of this Order are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.

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

T. Consideration of Public Comment. The Regional Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.

TENTATIVE ORDER

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

A. Discharge of wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in the Findings is prohibited.

B. The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).

C. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.

D. The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the collection, treatment, and disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.

TENTATIVE ORDER

IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP (Attachment E):

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

Table 6. Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	40	63	83	--	--
TSS	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	40	63	83	--	--
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	374	--	750	--	--
Ammonia (as N)	µg/L	0.3	--	1.5	--	--
Bromoform	µg/L	4.3	--	8.6	--	--
Chloro-dibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	--	0.82	--	--
Chloroform	µg/L	80	--	160	--	--
Cyanide	µg/L	4.3	--	8.5	--	--
Dichloro-bromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	10	--	--	--	--
Trihalomethanes [2, 3]	µg/L	80	--	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Settleable Solids	mL/L-hr	0.1	--	0.2	--	--

[1] Based on a design flow of 0.5 mgd.

[2] Reported as Total.

[3] Trihalomethanes include bromoform, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane.

b. **Mercury.** The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.0014 lbs/month.

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

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

   i. 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
   ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and
   iii. 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

g. **Iron, Total Recoverable.** For a calendar year, the annual average effluent concentration shall not exceed 300 µg/L.

h. **Manganese, Total Recoverable.** For a calendar year, the annual average effluent concentration shall not exceed 50 µg/L.

i. **Aluminum, Total Recoverable.** For a calendar year, the annual average effluent concentration shall not exceed 200 µg/L.

j. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The ADWF shall not exceed 0.5 mgd.

2. Interim Effluent Limitations.

a. During the period beginning **Permit Effective Date** and ending **five years from the effective date of this Order**, the Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP These interim effluent limitations shall apply in lieu of the corresponding final effluent limitations specified for the same parameters during the time period indicated in this provision.

Table 7a. Interim Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Ammonia[1]	mg/L	--	--	13	--	--
Iron	µg/L	--	--	1800	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Manganese	µg/L	--	--	360	--	--
Nitrate	mg/L	--	--	47	--	--

1 Reported as Total.

b. As specified in Time Schedule Order No. R5-2007-0096, during the period beginning on the **Permit Effective Date** and ending on **1 October 2010**, the Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP. These interim effluent limitations shall apply in lieu of the corresponding final effluent limitations specified for the same parameters during the time period indicated in this provision.

Table 7b. Interim Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations			
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Monthly Median
BOD (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	60	90	120	--
	lbs/day[1]	250	376	500	--
TSS	mg/L	110	165	220	--
	lbs/day[1]	460	690	920	--
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	--	500	23

c. During the period beginning **Permit Effective Date** and ending on **17 May 2010**, the Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP. These interim effluent limitations shall apply in lieu of the corresponding final effluent limitations specified for the same parameters during the time period indicated in this provision.

Table 7c. Interim Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Bromoform	µg/L	--	--	14	--	--
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	--	--	130	--	--
Chloroform	mg/L	--	--	860	--	--
Cyanide	µg/L	--	--	130	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	--	--	320	--	--

B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable

TENTATIVE ORDER

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 Salt Creek:

1. **Bacteria**. The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than ten percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.

2. **Biostimulatory Substances**. Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

3. **Chemical Constituents**. Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

4. **Color**. Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

5. **Dissolved Oxygen**:

   a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass;
   b. The 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor
   c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time.

6. **Floating Material**. Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

7. **Oil and Grease**. Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

8. **pH**. The pH to be depressed below 6.5, raised above 8.5, nor changed by more than 0.5 units.

9. **Pesticides**:

   a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
   b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;

TENTATIVE ORDER

c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by USEPA or the Executive Officer.
d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR §131.12.).
e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable.
f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15.
g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.

10. **Radioactivity**:

    a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
    b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the maximum contaminant levels specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.

11. **Suspended Sediments**. The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

12. **Settleable Substances**. Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

13. **Suspended Material**. Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

14. **Taste and Odors**. Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

15. **Temperature**. The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F. A one-month averaging period may be used when determining compliance with this Receiving Surface Water Limitation for temperature.

16. **Toxicity**. Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.

17. **Turbidity**. The turbidity to increase as follows:

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

B. Groundwater Limitations

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

1. Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility shall not, in combination with other sources of the waste constituents, cause groundwater within influence of the Facility to contain waste constituents in concentrations in excess of natural background quality or that listed below, whichever is greater:

   a. Total coliform organisms median of 2.2 MPN/100 mL over any seven-day period.

VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

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

2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions:

   a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, Division 3, Chapter 26.

   b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:

      i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;

      ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;

      iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and

TENTATIVE ORDER

iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

- *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.

- *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.

- *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

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

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

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

d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under Sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:

   i. contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or

   ii. controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

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

e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.

TENTATIVE ORDER

f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the State or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include such accelerated or additional monitoring as necessary to determine the nature and impact of the non-complying discharge or sludge use or disposal.

g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by USEPA under Section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.

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

i. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.

j. Safeguard to electric power failure:

   i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.

   ii. Upon written request by the Regional Water Board the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past five years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Regional Water Board.

   iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Regional Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within ninety days of having been advised in writing by the Regional Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Regional Water Board and USEPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Regional Water Board, become a condition of this Order.

k. The Discharger, upon written request of the Regional Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under Regional Water Board Standard Provision VI.A.2.m.

TENTATIVE 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.

l. A publicly owned treatment works (POTW) whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last three years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in four years, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Regional Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.

m. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with Title 16, CCR, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

p. Effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.

q. All monitoring and analysis instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy.

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

s. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Regional Water Board, and shall be submitted in such a format as to allow direct comparison with the limitations and requirements of this Order. Unless otherwise specified, discharge flows shall be reported in terms of the monthly average and the daily maximum discharge flows.

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

u. For POTWs, prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. (CWC section 1211).

v. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, maximum daily effluent limitation, 1-hour average effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation contained in this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by telephone (916) 464-3291 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless the Regional Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by Attachment D, Section V.E.1 [40 CFR section 122.41(l)(6)(i)].

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

a. This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not limited to, fish tissue sampling, whole effluent toxicity, monitoring requirements on internal waste stream(s), and monitoring for surrogate parameters. Additional requirements may be included in this Order as a result of the special condition monitoring data.

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

   i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or 2approved pursuant to Section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.

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

c. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and the interim mass effluent limitation modified (higher or lower) or an effluent concentration limitation imposed. If the Regional Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the interim mercury mass loading limitation(s) and the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.

d. **Pollution Prevention.** This Order requires the Discharger prepare pollution prevention plans following CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) for ammonia, cyanide, iron, manganese, nitrate, and total trihalomethanes. Based on a review of the pollution prevention plans, this Order may be reopened for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for these constituents.

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

evaluation and minimization plan this Order may be reopened for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for salinity.

f. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on the new provisions.

TENTATIVE ORDER

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section V.). Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the toxicity numeric monitoring trigger established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent reoccurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This Provision includes requirements for the Discharger to develop and submit a TRE Work Plan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.

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

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

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

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

ii. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. WET testing results exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring demonstrates a pattern of toxicity and requires the Discharger to initiate a TRE to address the effluent toxicity.

iii. **Numeric Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is > **1 TUc** (where TUc = 100/NOEC). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE.

iv. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four (4) chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e. one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:

a) If the results of four (4) consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (i.e. temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four (4) consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.

c) If the result of any accelerated toxicity test exceeds the monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE to investigate the cause(s) of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. Within thirty (30) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Regional Water Board including, at minimum:

1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including TRE WET monitoring schedule;

2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and

TENTATIVE ORDER

3) A schedule for these actions.

b. **Best Practicable Treatment or Control (BPTC) Evaluation Tasks**. In compliance with the requirements contained in Time Schedule Order No. R5-2007-0096, the Discharger shall ensure the treatment facility is capable of complying with the effluent limitations and requirements of this Order and in providing BPTC as required by Resolution 68-16.

c. **Groundwater Monitoring.** To determine compliance with Groundwater Limitations V.B., the groundwater monitoring network shall include one or more background monitoring wells and a sufficient number of designated monitoring wells downgradient of every treatment, storage, and disposal unit that does or may release waste constituents to groundwater.

All wells shall comply with appropriate standards as described in *California Well Standards Bulletin 74-90* (June 1991) and *Water Well Standards: State of California Bulletin 94-81* (December 1981), and any more stringent standards adopted by the Discharger or county pursuant to CWC Section 13801.

The Discharger shall install approved monitoring wells and commence groundwater monitoring in accord with this Order's Monitoring and Reporting Program and the time schedule below. After the first sampling event, the Discharger shall report on its sampling protocol as specified in the MRP. The Discharger shall comply with the following compliance schedule in implementing the work required by this Provision:

The Discharger, after one year of monitoring, shall characterize natural background quality of monitored constituents in a technical report, to be submitted by **15 months after the effective date of this Order**. For each groundwater monitoring parameter/constituent identified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section VII.B.), the report shall present a summary of monitoring data, calculation of the concentration in background monitoring wells, and a comparison of background groundwater quality to that in wells used to monitor the facility. Determination of background quality shall be made using the methods described in Title 27 California Code of Regulations Section 20415(e)(10), and shall be based on data from at least four consecutive quarterly (or more frequent) groundwater monitoring events. For each monitoring parameter/constituent, the report shall compare measured concentrations for compliance monitoring wells with the calculated background concentration.

If the monitoring shows that any constituent concentrations are increased above background water quality, the Discharger shall submit a technical report by **2 years after the effective date of this Order** describing the groundwater technical report results and critiquing each evaluated component of the Facility with respect to BPTC and minimizing the discharge's impact on groundwater quality. In no case shall the discharge be allowed to exceed the Groundwater Limitations. This Order may be reopened and additional groundwater limitations added.

TENTATIVE ORDER

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

a. **Pollution Prevention Plan for ammonia, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, iron, manganese, nitrate, and total trihalomethanes.** The Discharger shall prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan for ammonia, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, iron, manganese, nitrate, and total trihalomethanes in accordance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The minimum requirements for the pollution prevention plan are outlined in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F, VII.B.3. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the pollution prevention plan shall be completed and submitted **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The Pollution Prevention Plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within two (2) years following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).

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

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

a. **Treatment Pond Operating Requirements.**

i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.

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

iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,

a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.
b) Weeds shall be minimized.
c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.

iv. Freeboard shall never be less than two feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow.

v. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary inflow and infiltration

TENTATIVE ORDER

during the non-irrigation season. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns. Freeboard shall never be less than two feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).

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

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

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

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

c. **Biosolids Disposal Requirements**

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

ii. Any proposed change in biosolids use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and U.S. EPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.

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

d. **Biosolids Storage Requirements**

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

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

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

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

e. **Collection System.** On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order 2006-0003, a Statewide General WDR for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order 2006-0003 and any future revisions thereto. Order 2006-0003 requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the General WDR.

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

f. This permit, and the Monitoring and Reporting Program which is a part of this permit, requires that certain parameters be monitored on a continuous basis. The wastewater treatment plant is not staffed on a full time basis. Permit violations or system upsets can go undetected during this period. The Discharger is required to establish an electronic system for operator notification for continuous recording device alarms. For existing continuous monitoring systems, the electronic notification system shall be installed **within six months of adoption** of this permit. For systems installed following permit adoption, the notification system shall be installed simultaneously.

g. **Turbidity Operational Requirements.** The Discharger shall operate the treatment system to ensure that the turbidity measured at EFF-001, as described in the MRP (Attachment E), shall not exceed:
   i. 2 NTU as a daily average, and
   ii. 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period, and
   iii. 10 NTU, at any time.

6. Other Special Provisions

a. 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

TENTATIVE ORDER

requirements, a violation of the California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

7. Compliance Schedules

a. **Title 22 Disinfection Requirements. By 1 October 2010**, wastewater discharged to the Salt Creek shall be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to the DPH reclamation criteria, Title 22 CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3, (Title 22) or equivalent. Until final compliance, the Discharger shall submit progress reports in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).

b. **Compliance Schedules for Final Effluent Limitations for ammonia, iron, manganese, and nitrate.**

i. **By five years from the effective date of this Order,** the Discharger shall comply with the final effluent limitations for ammonia, iron, manganese, and nitrate. On 29 June 2007, the Discharger submitted a compliance schedule justification for ammonia, iron, manganese, and nitrate. The compliance schedule justification included all items specified in Paragraph 3, items (a) through (d), of section 2.1 of the SIP. As this compliance schedule is greater than one year, the Discharger shall submit semi-annual progress reports in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.)

ii. **Pollution Prevention Plan.** The Discharger shall prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan for ammonia, iron, manganese, and nitrate, in accordance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The minimum requirements for the pollution prevention plan are outlined in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the pollution prevention plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The Pollution Prevention Plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within two (2) years following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).

iii. **Treatment Feasibility Study.** The Discharger is required to perform an engineering treatment feasibility study examining the feasibility, costs and benefits of different treatment options that may be required to remove ammonia, iron, manganese, and nitrate from the discharge. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the treatment feasibility study shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The treatment feasibility study shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within two (2) years following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance

TENTATIVE ORDER

with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).

c. **Compliance Schedules for Final Effluent Limitations for bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, and dichlorobromomethane.**

i. **By 18 May 2010,** the Discharger shall comply with the final effluent limitations for bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, and dichlorobromomethane. On 29 June 2007, the Discharger submitted a compliance schedule justification for bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, and dichlorobromomethane. The compliance schedule justification included all items specified in Paragraph 3, items (a) through (d), of section 2.1 of the SIP. As this compliance schedule is greater than one year, the Discharger shall submit semi-annual progress reports in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.)

ii. **Pollution Prevention Plan.** The Discharger shall prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan for bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, and dichlorobromomethane, in accordance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The minimum requirements for the pollution prevention plan are outlined in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the pollution prevention plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The Pollution Prevention Plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within two (2) years following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.). The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

iii. **Treatment Feasibility Study.** The Discharger is required to perform an engineering treatment feasibility study examining the feasibility, costs and benefits of different treatment options that may be required to remove bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, and dichlorobromomethane from the discharge. A work plan and time schedule for preparation of the treatment feasibility study shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 6 months of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer. The treatment feasibility study shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within two (2) years following work plan approval by the Executive Officer**, and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1.).

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

A. **BOD and TSS Effluent Limitations**. Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD and TSS shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of 20°C BOD (5-day) and total suspended solids in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

B. **Total Mercury Mass Loading Effluent Limitations.** The procedures for calculating mass loadings are as follows:

   1. The total pollutant mass load for each individual calendar month shall be determined using an average of all concentration data collected that month and the corresponding total monthly flow. All monitoring data collected under the monitoring and reporting program, pretreatment program and any special studies shall be used for these calculations.

   2. In calculating compliance, the Discharger shall count all non-detect measures at one-half of the detection level. If compliance with the effluent limitation is not attained due to the non-detect contribution, the Discharger shall improve and implement available analytical capabilities and compliance shall be evaluated with consideration of the detection limits.

C. **Average Dry Weather Flow (ADWF) Effluent Limitations**. The ADWF is intended to represent the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the ADWF effluent limitations will be determined annually based on the average daily flow over 3 consecutive dry weather months (i.e., July, August, and September)

D. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.)**. For each day that an effluent sample is collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms, the 7-day median shall be determined by calculating the median concentration of total coliform bacteria in the effluent utilizing the bacteriological results of the last seven days for which analyses have been completed. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a most probable number (MPN) of 2.2 per 100 milliliters, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance for that parameter for that 1 day only within the reporting period.

E. **Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations.** Continuous monitoring analyzers for chlorine residual or for dechlorination agent residual in the effluent are appropriate methods for compliance determination. A positive residual dechlorination agent in the effluent indicates that chlorine is not present in the discharge, which demonstrates compliance with the effluent limitations. This type of monitoring can also be used to prove that some chlorine residual exceedances are false positives. Continuous monitoring data showing either a positive dechlorination agent residual or a chlorine

TENTATIVE ORDER

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.

TENTATIVE ORDER

TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

Arithmetic Mean (μ), also called the average, is the sum of measured values divided by the number of samples. For ambient water concentrations, the arithmetic mean is calculated as follows:

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

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL): the highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

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

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

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

Carcinogenic pollutants are substances that are known to cause cancer in living organisms.

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

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

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

arithmetic mean of analytical results from one or more grab samples taken over the course of the day.

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

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ) are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL.

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

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

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

Inland Surface Waters are all surface waters of the State that do not include the ocean, enclosed bays, or estuaries.

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

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

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

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

Method Detection Limit (MDL) is the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 136, Attachment B, revised as of 3 July 1999.

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

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

Not Detected (ND) are those sample results less than the laboratory's MDL.

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

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

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

Reporting Level (RL) is the ML (and its associated analytical method) chosen by the Discharger for reporting and compliance determination from the MLs included in this Order. The MLs included in this Order correspond to approved analytical methods for reporting a sample result that are selected by the Regional Water Board either from Appendix 4 of the SIP in accordance with section 2.4.2 of the SIP or established in accordance with section 2.4.3 of the SIP. The ML is based on the proper application of method-based analytical procedures for

TENTATIVE ORDER

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.

Source of Drinking Water is any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Regional Water Board Basin Plan.

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

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

where:

x is the observed value;
μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and
n is the number of samples.

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT B – MAP



Drawing Reference:	SITE LOCATION MAP	
WILLIAMS U.S.G.S TOPOGRAPHIC MAP 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE *Topographic Map Dated 1994*	CITY OF WILLIAMS WILLIAMS WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT COLUSA	N W E S

TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC



TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT D –STANDARD PROVISIONS

TENTATIVE ORDER

I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action, for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a permit renewal application. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a).)

2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under Section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1).)

B. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense

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

C. Duty to Mitigate

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

D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

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

E. Property Rights

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g).)

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

F. Inspection and Entry

The Discharger shall allow the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, § 13383):

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1));

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

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

4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4).)

G. Bypass

1. Definitions

   a. “Bypass” means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i).)

   b. “Severe property damage” means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii).)

2. Bypass not exceeding limitations. The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3, I.G.4, and I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2).)

TENTATIVE ORDER

3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Regional Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):

   a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));

   b. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and

   c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Regional Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)

4. The Regional Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Regional Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)

5. Notice

   a. Anticipated bypass. If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)

   b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)

H. Upset

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

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was

TENTATIVE ORDER

caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).).

2. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A Discharger who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):

   a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));

   b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));

   c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and

   d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv).)

3. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the Discharger seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(4).)

II. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION

A. General

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

B. Duty to Reapply

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

C. Transfers

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

A. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1).)

B. Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures under Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under Part 136 unless otherwise specified in Part 503 unless other test procedures have been specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(4); § 122.44(i)(1)(iv).)

IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

A. Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Discharger's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by Part 503), the Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Regional Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2).)

B. Records of monitoring information shall include:

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

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

1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(1)); and
2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(2).)

TENTATIVE ORDER

V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

A. Duty to Provide Information

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

2. All permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of USEPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).).

3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

   a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));

   b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and

   c. The written authorization is submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)

TENTATIVE ORDER

4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)

5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

   "I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations." (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d).)

C. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(l)(4).)

2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)

3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under Part 136 unless otherwise specified in Part 503, or as specified in this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Regional Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii).)

4. Calculations for all limitations, which require averaging of measurements, shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii).)

D. Compliance Schedules

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)

2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):

   a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)

   b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)

3. The Regional Water Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii).)

F. Planned Changes

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

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or

2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are subject neither to effluent limitations in this Order nor to notification requirements under section 122.42(a)(1) (see Additional Provisions—Notification Levels VII.A.1). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii).)

3. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R.§ 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

TENTATIVE ORDER

G. Anticipated Noncompliance

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

H. Other Noncompliance

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

I. Other Information

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

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

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

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)

All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Regional Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and

2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2).)

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Table of Contents

Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) E-1
I. General Monitoring Provisions E-1
II. Monitoring Locations E-2
III. Influent Monitoring Requirements E-2
A. Monitoring Location INF-001 ..... E-2
IV. Effluent Monitoring Requirements E-3
A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 ..... E-3
V. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements E-5
VI. Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable E-8
VII. Reclamation Monitoring Requirements – not applicable E-8
VIII. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Surface Water and Groundwater E-8
A. Monitoring Location RSW-001U, RSW-002D, RSW-003D E-8
B. Monitoring Location RGW-001 to RGW-00N E-9
IX. Other Monitoring Requirements E-10
A, Pond monitoring E-10
B. Biosolids E-10
B. Municipal Water Supply E-11
X. Reporting Requirements E-12
A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements E-12
B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs) E-13
C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) E-15
D. Other Reports E-15

List of Tables

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations E-2
Table E-2. Influent Monitoring E-2
Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring E-3
Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series E-6
Table E-5a. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements E-8
Table E-5b. Groundwater Monitoring Requirements E-9
Table E-6. Pond Monitoring Requirements E-10
Table E-7. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements E-11
Table E-8. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule E-14
Table E-9. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Progress Reports E-16

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

A. Samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. All samples shall be taken at the monitoring locations specified below and, unless otherwise specified, before the monitored flow joins or is diluted by any other waste stream, body of water, or substance. Monitoring locations shall not be changed without notification to and the approval of this Regional Water Board.

B. Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the State Department of Health Services. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger, analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program must be kept in the laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Regional Water Board staff. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Regional Water Board.

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

D. Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.

E. Monitoring results, including noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.

II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

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

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description (include Latitude and Longitude when available)
--	INF-001	Treatment plant headworks
001	EFF-001	Downstream from the last connection through which waste can be admitted to the outfall (39º, 10', 11" N, 122º, 9', 13" W)
--	RSW-001U	50 feet upstream from Discharge Point 001 in Salt Creek
--	RSW-002D	200 feet downstream from Discharge Point 001 in Salt Creek
--	RSW-003D	3,000 feet downstream from Discharge Point 001 in Salt Creek
--	RGW-001 to RGW-00N	Groundwater monitoring wells, where N is the number of wells
	PND-001	Pond 1
	PND-002	Pond 2
	PND-003	Pond 3
	PND-004	Pond 4
--	BIO-001	Biosolids
--	SPL-001	Municipal Water Supply Source Water

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

1. Samples shall be collected at approximately the same time as effluent samples and should be representative of the influent for the period sampled.

2. 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]
pH	standard units	Grab	1/week	[2]
BOD (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite [1]	2/month	[2]
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite [1]	2/month	[2]

[1] 24-hour flow proportional composite.

TENTATIVE ORDER

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

1. Effluent samples shall be collected downstream from the last connection through which wastes can be admitted into the outfall, following the last unit process. Effluent samples should be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. Time of collection of samples shall be recorded.

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

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method and (Minimum Level, units), respectively
Flow	mgd	Meter	Continuous	[1]
Total Residual Chlorine [2]	mg/L	Meter	Continuous	[1]
Turbidity[3]	NTU	Meter	Continuous	[1]
pH	standard units	Grab[4]	3/ Week	[1]
Electrical Conductivity @ 25 °C	µmhos/cm	Grab	3/ Week	[1]
Temperature	°F	Grab	3/Week	[1]
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	3/Week	[1]
Ammonia (as N) [5,6]	mg/L	Grab	2/ Week	[1]
BOD (5-day @ 20 °C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite [7]	1/Week	[1]
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite [7]	1/Week	[1]
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Week	[1]
Settleable Solids	mL/L-hr	24-hr Composite [7]	1/Week	[1]
Aluminum	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Bromoform	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Carbofuran	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Chloroform	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Chlorpyrifos	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Cyanide	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides[8]	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Iron, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Manganese, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]

TENTATIVE ORDER

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method and (Minimum Level, units), respectively
Mercury	µg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Methoxychlor	µg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/month	[1]
Total Trihalomethanes	ug/L	Calculate	1/month	[1]
Hardness[9]	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[1]
Whole Effluent Toxicity	TU	Calculated	[10]	[6]
Standard Minerals [11]	mg/L	Grab	1/year	[1]
Priority Pollutants [12,13]	µg/L	Grab	1/year	[1]

[1] Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR sections 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest MLs specified in Appendix 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. Samples shall be collected downstream of last chlorine addition, after de-chlorination.

[3] Turbidity shall be monitored beginning on the effective date of the final turbidity effluent limitation in this Order or when filtration is added to the treatment process, whichever is sooner.

[4] Grab samples shall not be collected at the same time each day.

[5] Concurrent with biotoxicity monitoring.

[6] Temperature and pH data shall be collected on the same date and at the same time as the ammonia sample.

[7] 24-hour flow proportioned composite.

[8] At a minimum, testing must included organochlorine pesticides (EPA 8081A), chlorinated herbicides (EPA 8151A), and Group A pesticides.

[9] Hardness samples to be taken concurrently with metals samples.).

[10] See Attachment E, Section V.

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

[12] Priority Pollutants is defined as USEPA Priority Pollutants and consists of the constituents listed in the most recent National Toxics Rule and California Toxics Rule.

[13] For priority pollutant constituents with effluent limitations, detection limits shall be below the effluent limitations. If the lowest ML published in Appendix 4 of the 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.

[14] All peaks are to be reported, along with any explanation provided by the laboratory.

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

2. If the discharge is intermittent rather than continuous, then on the first day of each such intermittent discharge, the Discharger shall monitor and record data for all of the constituents listed above, except for priority pollutants, after which the frequencies of analysis given in the schedule shall apply for the duration of each such intermittent discharge. In no event shall the Discharger be required to monitor and record data more often than twice the frequencies listed in the schedule.

TENTATIVE ORDER

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

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

1. *Monitoring Frequency* – the Discharger shall perform semi-annual acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling.

2. *Sample Types* – For static non-renewal and static renewal testing, the samples shall be flow proportional 24-hour composites and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at the effluent monitoring location EFF-001.

3. *Test Species* – Test species shall be fathead minnows (*Pimephales promelas*).

4. *Methods* – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.

5. *Test Failure* – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 7 days following notification of test failure.

B. **Chronic Toxicity Testing**. The Discharger shall conduct three species chronic toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

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

2. *Sample Types* – Effluent samples shall be flow proportional 24-hour composites and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at the effluent monitoring location specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from the RSW-001U sampling location, as identified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program.

3. *Sample Volumes* – Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.

4. *Test Species* – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g. reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:

   - The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);

TENTATIVE ORDER

- 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 Table E-5, below. The receiving water control shall be used as the diluent (unless the receiving water is toxic). If the receiving water is toxic, laboratory control water may be used as the diluent, in which case, the receiving water should still be sampled and tested to provide evidence of its toxicity.

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 Special Provisions VI.C.2.a.iii.)

Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Regular chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Regional Water Board 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 $100/LC_{50}$, $100/EC_{25}$, $100/IC_{25}$, and $100/IC_{50}$, as appropriate.

   b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;

   c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the percent minimum significant difference (PMSD);

   d. The dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test; and

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

   Additionally, the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports shall contain an updated chronology of chronic toxicity test results expressed in TUc, and organized by test species, type of test (survival, growth or reproduction), and monitoring frequency, i.e., either quarterly, monthly, accelerated, or TRE.

2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports and reported as percent survival.

3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for Toxicity Reduction Evaluations shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Work Plan.

4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:

   a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.

   b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.

   c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.

TENTATIVE ORDER

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VII. RECLAMATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – SURFACE WATER AND GROUNDWATER

A. Monitoring Location RSW-001U, RSW-002D, RSW-003D

1. The Discharger shall monitor Salt Creek at RSW-001U, RSW-002D, and RSW-003D as follows:

Table E-5a. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/week	[1, 2]
pH[3]	standard units	Grab	1/week	[1, 2]
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/week	[2]
Temperature[3]	°F	Grab	1/week	[1, 2]
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/week	[1, 2]
Fecal Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/week	[2]
Hardness (as CaCO3)	mg/L	Grab	1/month	[2]
Radionuclides	pCi/L	Grab	1/year	[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 WWTP.

[2] Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR sections 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest MLs specified in Appendix 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] pH and temperature shall be determined at the time of sample collection for effluent ammonia.

2. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Stations R-00lU and R-002D. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:

   a. Floating or suspended matter
   b. Discoloration
   c. Bottom deposits
   d. Aquatic life
   e. Visible films, sheens or coatings
   f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths
   g. Potential nuisance conditions

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

TENTATIVE ORDER

B. Monitoring Location RGW-001 to RGW-00N

1. Groundwater grab samples shall be collected from all groundwater monitoring wells. Prior to sampling, the wells should be pumped until the temperature, specific conductivity, and pH have stabilized to ensure representative samples.

2. The Discharger shall monitor groundwater at RGW-001 to RGW-00N as follows:

Table E-5b. Groundwater Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Depth to Groundwater	Feet	Grab	1/month	
Groundwater Elevation [1]	Feet	Grab	1/month	
pH	standard units	Grab	1/month	[2,3]
Electrical Conductivity at 25ºC	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/month	[2,3]
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/month	[3]
Nitrate	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[3]
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[3]
Total Ammonia (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	[3]
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/quarter	[3]
Fecal Coliform Organisms [4]	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/quarter	[3]
Priority Pollutants	µg/L	Grab	1/year	[3]

[1] Groundwater elevation shall be used to calculate the direction and gradient of groundwater flow. Elevations shall be measured to the nearest one-hundredth of a foot from mean sea level. The groundwater elevation shall be measured prior to purging the wells.

[2] 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 WWTP.

[3] Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR sections 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest MLs specified in Appendix 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.

[4] Sampling for fecal coliform shall be performed for at least two consecutive quarters in any groundwater monitoring well following the detection in that well of total coliform organisms in excess of 2.2 MPN/100 mL.

3. Prior to collecting samples and after measuring the water level, each monitoring well shall be adequately purged to remove water that has been standing within the well screen and casing that may not be chemically representative of formation water. Depending on the hydraulic conductivity of the geologic setting, the volume removed during purging is typically from 3 to 5 volumes of the standing water within the well casing and screen, or additionally the filter pack pore volume.

4. In the technical report submitted pursuant to Section V.B of the Order describing the results of the first sampling event performed pursuant to this program, the Discharger shall include a detailed description of the procedures and techniques for:

   a. sample collection, including purging techniques, sampling equipment, and decontamination of sampling equipment;
   b. sample preservation and shipment;
   c. analytical procedures; and
   d. chain of custody control.

   As it continues to monitor groundwater pursuant to this program, the Discharger shall report when it deviates from these procedures and techniques.

TENTATIVE ORDER

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A, Pond monitoring

1. The Discharger shall monitor the ponds at monitoring locations PND 001, PND 002, PND 003, and PND 004 as follows:

Table E-6. Pond Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Freeboard	feet	Grab	1/day	
pH	pH Units	Grab	1/week	
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/week	
Nitrate	mg/L	Grab	1/month	
Nitrite	mg/L	Grab	1/month	
TKN	mg/L	Grab	1/month	
Odors	Observation	--	1/week	
Levee Condition	Observation	--	1/week	
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/month	

B. Biosolids

1. **Monitoring Location BIO-001**

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

   2. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected when sludge is removed from the ponds for disposal in accordance with USEPA's POTW Sludge Sampling and

Analysis Guidance Document, August 1989, and tested for the metals listed in Title 22.

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

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

B. 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]
Standard Minerals [3]	mg/L	Grab	1/year	[2]

[1] If the water supply is from more than one source, the monitoring report 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 sections 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest MLs specified in Appendix 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] Standard minerals shall include all major cations and anions and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

TENTATIVE ORDER

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.

1. 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).

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

3. 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.

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

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

   a. Sample results greater than or equal to the RL shall be reported as measured by the laboratory (i.e., the measured chemical concentration in the sample).

   b. Sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL, shall be reported as "Detected, but Not Quantified," or DNQ. The estimated chemical concentration of the sample shall also be reported.

      For the purposes of data collection, the laboratory shall write the estimated chemical concentration next to DNQ as well as the words "Estimated Concentration" (may be shortened to "Est. Conc."). The laboratory may, if such information is available, include numerical estimates of the data quality for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy (± a percentage of the reported value), numerical ranges (low to high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.

   c. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected," or ND.

TENTATIVE ORDER

d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the ML value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from *extrapolation* beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.

5. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an AMEL , AWEL, or MDEL for priority pollutants and more than one sample result is available, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) or "Not Detected" (ND). In those cases, the Discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:

   a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.

   b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.

B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

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

2. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board by the **first day** of the second month following sample collection. Quarterly and annual monitoring results shall be submitted by the **first day of the second month following each calendar quarter, semi-annual period, and year**, respectively.

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

4. With the exception of flow, all constituents monitored on a continuous basis (metered), shall be reported as daily maximums, daily minimums, and daily

TENTATIVE ORDER

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

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

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

8. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

Table E-8. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On…	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling.
1/day	Permit effective date	Any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling.
1/week	Sunday following permit effective date or on permit effective date if on a Sunday	Sunday through Saturday	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
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	1st day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling.

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On…	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
1/quarter	Closest of 1January, 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 February

TENTATIVE ORDER

C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs)

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

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

STANDARD MAIL	FEDEX/UPS/ OTHER PRIVATE CARRIERS
State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center PO Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-1000	State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center 1001 I Street, 15th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814

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

D. Other Reports

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

Table E-9. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Progress Reports

Special Provision	Reporting Requirements
Pollution Prevention Plan for ammonia, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, iron, manganese, persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides, and total trihalomethanes (Special Provisions VI.C.3.a.)	**1 December**, annually, after approval of work plan
Salinity Minimization Plan	**1 December**
Title 22 Disinfection Requirements (Special Provisions VI.C.7.a.)	**1 December**, annually, until final compliance
BPTC Evaluation Tasks (Special Provisions VI.C.2.c.)	**1 February**, annually**,** following completion of Task 4 of BPTC Evaluation Compliance Schedule
Compliance Schedules for Final Effluent Limitations for ammonia, carbon tetrachloride, cyanide, iron, manganese, persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides, and total trihalomethanes compliance with final effluent limitations. (Special Provisions VI.C.7.b.)	**1 June**, annually, until final compliance

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

3. The Discharger's sanitary sewer system collects wastewater using sewers, pipes, pumps, and/or other conveyance systems and directs the raw sewage to the wastewater treatment plant. A "sanitary sewer overflow" is defined as a discharge to ground or surface water from the sanitary sewer system at any point upstream of the wastewater treatment plant. Sanitary sewer overflows are prohibited by this Order. All violations must be reported as required in Standard Provisions. Facilities (such as wet wells, regulated impoundments, tanks, highlines, *etc*.) may be part of a sanitary sewer system and discharges to these facilities are not considered sanitary sewer overflows, provided that the waste is fully contained within these temporary storage facilities.

4. **Annual Operations Report**. By **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.

TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Table of Contents

Attachment F – Fact Sheet F-1
I. Permit Information F-1
II. Facility Description F-2
A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls F-2
B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters F-2
C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data F-3
D. Compliance Summary F-4
E. Planned Changes F-5
III. Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations F-5
A. Legal Authority F-5
B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) F-5
C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans F-5
D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List F-7
E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations F-8
IV. Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications F-9
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-12
C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) F-14
1. Scope and Authority F-14
2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives F-14
3. Determining the Need for WQBELs F-16
4. WQBEL Calculations F-34
5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) F-38
D. Final Effluent Limitations F-39
1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations. F-39
2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations. F-39
3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements. F-40
4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy F-40
E. Interim Effluent Limitations F-42
F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable F-43
G. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable F-43
V. Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations F-43
A. Surface Water F-43
B. Groundwater F-47
VI. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements F-47
A. Influent Monitoring F-47
B. Effluent Monitoring F-48
C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements F-48
D. Receiving Water Monitoring F-48
1. Surface Water F-48
2. Groundwater F-48

TENTATIVE ORDER

E. Other Monitoring Requirements F-49
VII. Rationale for Provisions F-50
A. Standard Provisions F-50
B. Special Provisions F-50
1. Reopener Provisions F-50
2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements F-51
3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention F-54
4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications F-55
5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) F-55
6. Other Special Provisions F-55
7. Compliance Schedules F-55
VIII. Public Participation F-56
A. Notification of Interested Parties F-56
B. Written Comments F-56
C. Public Hearing F-57
D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions F-57
E. Information and Copying F-57
F. Register of Interested Persons F-57
G. Additional Information F-58

List of Tables

Table F-1. Facility Information F-1
Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data (Up to 30 December 2005) F-3
Table F-3. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data (After 30 December 2005) F-3
Table F-4. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations F-13
Table F-5. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives F-30
Table F-6. WQBEL Calculations for Ammonia F-36
Table F-7. WQBEL Calculations for Bromoform F-36
Table F-8. WQBEL Calculations for Chlorodibromomethane F-36
Table F-9. WQBEL Calculations for Cyanide F-36
Table F-10. WQBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane F-37
Table F-11. Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations F-37
Table F-12. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations F-40
Table F-13. Interim Effluent Limitation Calculation Summary F-43

TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in section II of this Order, this Fact Sheet includes the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the facility.

Table F-1. Facility Information

WDID	5A060103001
Discharger	City of Williams
Name of Facility	Williams Wastewater Treatment Plant, Williams
Facility Address	700 B Street
	Williams, CA 95987
	Colusa County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	Wes Goforth, Director of Public Services, (530) 473-5389
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	Greg Endeman, Wastewater Plant Operator, (530) 473-2519
Mailing Address	P.O. Box 310, Williams, CA 95987
Billing Address	SAME
Type of Facility	POTW
Major or Minor Facility	Minor
Threat to Water Quality	2
Complexity	A
Pretreatment Program	N
Reclamation Requirements	Not Applicable
Facility Permitted Flow	0.5 mgd
Facility Design Flow	0.5 mgd
Watershed	Sacramento
Receiving Water	Salt Creek
Receiving Water Type	Inland Surface Water – Ephemeral Stream

A. The City of Williams (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of Williams Wastewater Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW).

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

B. The Facility discharges wastewater to Salt Creek, a water of the United States, and is currently regulated by Order 5-01-049 which was adopted on 16 March 2001 and expired on 1 March 2006. 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 WDRs and NPDES permit on 3 October 2005 and a Technical Support Document for the RWD in December 2005. A site visit was conducted on 20 March 2006, to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and conditions.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the community of the City of Williams and serves a population of approximately 4,794. The Facility design daily average flow capacity is 0.5 million gallons per day (mgd).

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls

The treatment system at the Facility consists of headworks with grit removal, aerated waste stabilization ponds and chlorination/dechlorination. The influent wastewater passes through the grit removal chamber before directing to four aerated facultative ponds arranged in series. There are two aerators at pond #1, seven aerators at pond #2, two aerators at pond #3, and one aerator at pond #4. The detention time of the ponds is approximately 20 days. Sludge is occasionally removed from the ponds, dewatered and disposed off-site. The wastewater from the ponds is then infected and discharged into Salt Creek. Chlorine gas is used for chlorination and sodium bisulfite for dechlorination. The chlorine dosage varies between 15 mg/L to 24 mg/L. The sodium bisulfite dosage is approximately 60 mg/L.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 11, T15N, R3W, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B (Figure B-1), a part of this Order.

2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point 001 to Salt Creek, a water of the United States at point Latitude 38°, 47', 40" N and longitude -120°, 7', 35" W.

TENTATIVE ORDER

3. Salt Creek is a tributary to Freshwater Creek that flows into Colusa Basin Drain within Sacramento Watershed. The Colusa Basin Drain is tributary to the Sacramento River, which is tributary to the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta.

4. Salt Creek is an ephemeral stream.

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

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

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data (Up to 30 December 2005)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation				Monitoring Data (From April 2001 – To May 2005)
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Monthly Median	Maximum Daily	Highest Daily Discharge
Flow	mgd	--	--	--	--	1.5
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	60	90	--	120	60
	lbs/day [1]	250	376	--	500	167
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	110	165	--	220	160
	lbs/day [1]	460	690	--	920	414
Total Coliform	MPN/100 mL	--	--	--	500	900
Settleable Solids	mL/L	0.1	--	--	0.2	0
Ammonia as N	mg N/L	--	[2]	--	[2]	32.2
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	5.9	--	--	--	4.9
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	0.01		0.02	0.1

[1] Based on a design flow of 0.5 mgd.

[2] A table was attached showing ammonia effluent limitation at various pH and temperature.

Table F-3. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data (After 30 December 2005)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation				Monitoring Data (From April 2001 – To May 2005)
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	7-day Median	Maximum Daily	Highest Daily Discharge
Flow	mgd	--	--	--	0.5	48.06
BOD (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	--	20	Not Reported
	lbs/day [1]	42	63	--	84	Not Reported
TSS	mg/L	10	15	--	20	Not Reported
	lbs/day [1]	42	63	--	84	Not Reported
pH	standard units	--	--	--	8.5 [2]	7.5

TENTATIVE ORDER

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation				Monitoring Data (From April 2001 – To May 2005)
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	7-day Median	Maximum Daily	Highest Daily Discharge
Total Coliform	MPN/100 mL	--	--	2.2	23	Not Reported
Settleable Solids	mL/L	0.1	--	--	0.2	<0.1
Ammonia as N	mg N/L	--	--	[3]	[3]	Not Reported
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	5.9	--	--	--	Not Reported
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	0.01	--	0.02	<0.01
Turbidity	NTU	--	--	--	5 [4]	Not Reported

[1] Based on a design flow of 0.5 mgd.

[2] A table was attached showing ammonia effluent limitation at various pH and temperature.

[3] pH shall be between 6.5 and 8.5.

[4] The daily maximum limit is 5 NTU, the daily average shall not exceed 2 NTU.

2. The Report of Waste Discharge describes the POTW discharge as follows:

Design Flow (dry or wet weather):	0.5	mgd
Annual Average Daily Flow Rate:	0.44	mgd
Maximum Daily Flow Rate:	1.75	mgd
Maximum Temperature, Summer:	30	ºC
Average Temperature, Summer:	22	ºC
Maximum Temperature, Winter:	20	ºC
Average Temperature, Winter:	12	ºC
Minimum pH:	6.7	standard units
Maximum pH:	9.5	standard units
Maximum BOD (5-day @ 20 ºC) Concentration:	60	mg/L
Average BOD (5-day @ 20 ºC) Concentration:	15.6	mg/L
Maximum Total Suspended Solids Concentration:	160	mg/L
Average Total Suspended Solids Concentration:	51	mg/L
Maximum Fecal Coliform Concentration:	500	MPN/100 mL
Average Fecal Coliform Concentration:	23	MPN/100 mL

D. Compliance Summary

The Discharger received an Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R5-2008-0513 from the Regional Water Board dated March 18, 2008. The Discharger was charged for two million one hundred and mine thousand dollars penalty for violations of effluent limitations contained in Order No. 5-01-049.

TENTATIVE ORDER

Order No. 5-01-049 requires the WWTP provide tertiary treatment or equivalent after 30 December 2005. The Discharger has not upgraded its WWTP to provide and therefore is discharging in violation of its current permit.

The inspection report dated June 10, 2003 lists monitoring and reporting deficiencies. Monitoring and reporting irregularities were detected for temperature, electrical conductivity, BOD, TSS, receiving water turbidity, and receiving water summary. Unacceptable detection limits for residual chlorine and settleable solids were reported.

The Discharger received a Notice of Violation from the Regional Water Board dated June 12, 2003. The Discharger was discharging treated wastewater to surface waters in violation of the Waste Discharge Requirements. The effluent pH, total coliform, and ammonia were not in-compliance with the requirements found in the previous Order. In addition, the Discharger was found violating the receiving water requirements of turbidity, dissolved oxygen, fecal coliform.

According to Finding 11 of Order No. 5-01-049, the Discharger is required to submit a groundwater study. To date, the Discharger has not submitted this study.

E. Planned Changes

The Discharger is planning to expand and upgrade the existing pond system with an activated sludge process that removes organics and ammonia, followed by filtration and disinfection prior to discharge. Constructions for the wastewater treatment plant upgrades are scheduled to start in late summer or early fall of 2007. The plant is expected to attain operational level in 2008.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

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

A. Legal Authority

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

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

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

C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans

1. **Water Quality Control Plans**. The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised August 2006), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water

TENTATIVE ORDER

quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63 requires that, with certain exceptions, the Regional Water Board assign the municipal and domestic supply use to water bodies that do not have beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. The beneficial uses of the Salt Creek downstream of the discharge are municipal and domestic supply, agricultural irrigation, agricultural stock watering, water contact recreation, other non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater aquatic habitat, warm fish migration habitat, warm spawning habitat, and wildlife habitat.

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

The federal CWA section 101(a)(2), states: "*it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1, 1983.*" Federal Regulations, developed to implement the requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 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.

This Order contains Effluent Limitations requiring a tertiary level of treatment, or equivalent, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC section 13241 in establishing these requirements, as discussed in more detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section IV.B.).

2. **Antidegradation Policy.** Section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal

TENTATIVE ORDER

antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section IV.D.4.) the discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.

3. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at title 40, Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed. Compliance with the Anti-Backsliding requirements is discussed in Section IV.D.3.

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

5. **Stormwater Requirements.** USEPA promulgated Federal Regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the stormwater program and are obligated to comply with the Federal Regulations.

6. **Endangered Species Act.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. sections 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.

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

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 Clean Water Act, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. The waters on these lists do not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 30 November 2006 USEPA gave partial approval to California's 2006 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. EPA approved the waters and pollutants identified in California's three part Section 303(d) list with the exception of Walnut

TENTATIVE ORDER

Creek for toxicity and may identify additional waters and pollutants for inclusion on the 303(d) list if necessary. The Basin Plan references this list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), which are defined as "…*those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 CFR 130, et seq.)*." The Basin Plan also states, "*Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.*" Salt Creek is not listed on California's 2006 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. Salt Creek is tributary to the Colusa Basin Drain. The listing for the Colusa Basin Drain includes: azinphos-methyl, carbofuran, diazinon, group A pesticides (aldrin, dieldrin, chlordane, endrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, hexachlorocyclohexane (including lindane), endosulfan, and toxaphene), malathion, methyl parathion, molinate/ordram, and unknown toxicity.

Mercury was detected in the discharge at concentrations below the numerical water quality objective. Therefore, this Order does not contain effluent concentration-based limitations for mercury. However, because mercury is a bioaccumulative constituent, the discharge of mercury to Salt Creek may impact the downstream Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta as a mass loading, and an effluent mass limitation for mercury is included in this Order.

The USEPA requires the Regional Water Board to develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. A TMDL has not yet been established for mercury in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta. Therefore, this Order contains a performance-based effluent mass limitation for mercury for the effluent discharge to Salt Creek to maintain the mercury loading at the current level until a total maximum daily load (TMDL) can be established and EPA develops mercury standards that are protective of human health.

E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations

1. The discharge authorized herein and the treatment and storage facilities associated with the discharge of treated municipal wastewater, except for discharges of residual sludge and solid waste, are exempt from the requirements of Title 27, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 20005 *et seq*. (hereafter Title 27). The exemption, pursuant to Title 27 CCR section 20090(a), is based on the following:

   a. The waste consists primarily of domestic sewage and treated effluent;

   b. The waste 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.

TENTATIVE ORDER

2. The State Water Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California*. The requirements within this Order are consistent with the Policy.

IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

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

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

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life" (narrative toxicity objective). The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that surface water and groundwater do not contain chemical constituents, discoloration, toxic substances, radionuclides, or taste and odor producing substances that adversely affect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The Basin Plan also limits chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect surface water beneficial uses. For waters designated as municipal, the Basin Plan specifies that, at a minimum, waters shall not contain concentrations of constituents that exceed Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) of CCR Title 22. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

TENTATIVE ORDER

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.*

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

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

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

Based on this statutory requirement, USEPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in Part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD_5), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

Following publication of the secondary treatment regulations, legislative history indicates that Congress was concerned that USEPA had not "sanctioned" the use of certain biological treatment techniques that were effective in achieving significant reductions in BOD_5 and TSS for secondary treatment. Therefore to prevent unnecessary construction of costly new facilities, Congress included language in the 1981 amendment to the Construction Grants statues [Section 23 of Pub. L. 97-147] that required USEPA to provide allowance for alternative biological treatment technologies such as trickling filters or waste stabilization ponds. In response to this requirement, definition of secondary treatment was modified on September 20, 1984 and June 3, 1985, and published in the revised secondary treatment regulations contained in section 133.105. These regulations allow alternative limitations for facilities using trickling filters and waste stabilization ponds that meet the requirements for "equivalent to secondary treatment." These "equivalent to secondary treatment" limitations are *up to* 45 mg/L (monthly average) and *up to* 65 mg/L (weekly average) for BOD_5 and TSS.

Therefore, POTWs that use waste stabilization ponds, identified in section 133.103, as the principal process for secondary treatment and whose operation and maintenance data indicate that the TSS values specified in the equivalent-to-secondary regulations cannot be achieved, can qualify to have their minimum levels of effluent quality for TSS adjusted upwards.

Furthermore, in order to address the variations in facility performance due to geographic, climatic, or seasonal conditions in different States, the Alternative State Requirements (ASR) provision contained in section 133.105(d) was written. ASR allows States the flexibility to set permit limitations above the maximum levels of 45 mg/L (monthly average) and 65 mg/L (weekly average) for TSS from lagoons. However, before ASR limitations for suspended solids can be set, the effluent must meet the BOD limitations as prescribed by 40 section 133.102(a). Presently, the maximum TSS value set by the State of California for lagoon effluent is 95 mg/L. This value corresponds to a 30-day consecutive average or an average over duration of less than 30 days.

In order to be eligible for equivalent-to-secondary limitations, a POTW must meet all of the following criteria:

- The principal treatment process must be either a trickling filter or waste stabilization pond.
- The effluent quality consistently achieved, despite proper operations and maintenance, is in excess of 30 mg/L BOD_5 and TSS.
- Water quality is not adversely affected by the discharge. (40 C.F.R. § 133.101(g).)

The treatment works as a whole provides significant biological treatment such that a minimum 65 percent reduction of BOD_5 is consistently attained (30-day average).

TENTATIVE ORDER

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

a. **BOD_5 and TSS.** Federal Regulations, 40 CFR, Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD_5 and TSS. Tertiary treatment is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream and the final effluent limitations for BOD_5 and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process. BOD_5 is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The secondary and tertiary treatment standards for BOD_5 and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the treatment processes. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD_5 and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. In applying 40 CFR Part 133 for weekly and monthly average BOD_5 and TSS limitations, the application of tertiary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD_5 and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed; the 30-day average BOD_5 and TSS limitations have been revised to 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of a tertiary system. In addition to the average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations, a daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD_5 and TSS is included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. See Table F-3 for final technology-based effluent limitations required by this Order. In addition, 40 CFR 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. If 85 percent removal of BOD_5 and TSS must be achieved by a secondary treatment plant, it must also be achieved by a tertiary (i.e., treatment beyond secondary level) treatment plant. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD_5 and TSS over each calendar month.

b. **pH.** Federal regulations, 40 CFR Part 133, also establish technology-based effluent limitations for pH. The secondary treatment standards require the pH of the effluent to be no lower than 6.0 and no greater than 9.0 standard units.

c. **Flow.** The Facility was designed to provide an equivalent to secondary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 0.5 mgd. The facility is required to upgrade their facility to provide a tertiary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 0.5 mgd. This Order contains an Average Dry Weather Maximum Daily Discharge Flow effluent limit of 0.5 mgd.

TENTATIVE ORDER

Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point 001

Table F-4. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Average Dry Weather Flow	mgd	--	--	0.5	--	--
BOD (5-day @ 20 °C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	40	63	83	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	40	63	83	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0

1. Based on a design flow of 0.5 mgd.

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

As specified in section 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include WQBELs for pollutants (including toxicity) that are or may be discharged at levels that cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above any state water quality standard. The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in other state plans and policies, or any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

a. **Receiving Water.** The receiving stream is Salt Creek, which is tributary to the Colusa Basin Drain via Freshwater Creek. The applicable beneficial uses of Salt Creek are described above in Attachment F, Section III.C.1.

b. **Hardness.** While no effluent limitation for hardness is necessary in this Order, hardness is critical to the assessment of the need for, and the development of, effluent limitations for certain metals. The *California Toxics Rule* and the *National Toxics Rule* contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness, the lower the hardness the lower the water quality criteria. The hardness-dependent metal criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.

Effluent limitations for the discharge must be set to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water for all discharge conditions. In the absence of the option of including condition-dependent, “floating” effluent limitations that are reflective of actual hardness conditions at the time of discharge, effluent limitations must be set using a reasonable worst-case condition in order to protect beneficial uses for all discharge conditions. The SIP does not address how to determine 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. The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as $CaCO_3$), 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.[1] 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.

TENTATIVE ORDER

[1] See 40 CFR 131.38(c)(4)(i)

The point in the receiving water affected by the discharge is downstream of the discharge. As the effluent mixes with the receiving water, the hardness of the receiving water can change. Therefore, it is appropriate to use the ambient hardness downstream of the discharge that is a mixture of the effluent and receiving water for the determination of the CTR hardness-dependent metals criteria. Recent studies indicate that using the lowest recorded receiving water hardness for establishing water quality criteria is not always protective of the receiving water under various mixing conditions (e.g. when the effluent hardness is less than the receiving water hardness). The studies evaluated the relationships between hardness and the CTR metals criterion that is calculated using the CTR metals equation. The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR, is as follows:

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

Where:

H = Design Hardness
b = metal- and criterion-specific constant
m = metal- and criterion-specific constant

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 relationship between the Design Hardness and the resulting criterion in Equation 1 can exhibit either a downward-facing (i.e., concave downward) or an upward-facing (i.e., concave upward) curve depending on the values of the criterion-specific constants. The curve shapes for acute and chronic criteria for the metals are as follows:

Concave Downward: cadmium (chronic), chromium (III), copper, nickel, and zinc

Concave Upward: cadmium (acute), lead, and silver (acute)

For those contaminants where the regulatory criteria exhibit a concave downward relationship as a function of hardness, use of the lowest recorded effluent hardness for establishment of water quality objectives is fully protective of all beneficial uses regardless of whether the effluent or receiving water hardness is higher. Use of the lowest recorded effluent hardness is also protective under all possible mixing conditions between the effluent and the receiving water (i.e., from high dilution to no dilution). Therefore, for cadmium (chronic), chromium (III), copper, nickel, and zinc, the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness can be estimated by using the lowest effluent hardness. The water quality criteria for these metals were calculated for this Order using Equation 1 and a reported minimum effluent hardness of 286 mg/L as $CaCO_3$.

TENTATIVE ORDER

For those metals where the regulatory criteria exhibit a concave upward relationship as a function of hardness, water quality objectives based on either the effluent hardness or the receiving water hardness alone, would not be protective under all mixing scenarios. Instead, both the hardness of the upstream receiving water and the effluent is required to determine the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness. In this case, using the lowest upstream receiving water hardness in Equation 2, below, is protective if the effluent hardness is ALWAYS higher than the receiving water hardness. Under circumstances where the effluent hardness is not ALWAYS higher than the receiving water hardness, it may be appropriate to use the highest reported upstream receiving water hardness in Equation 2. The following equation provides fully protective water quality criteria for those metals that exhibit a concave upward relationship.

$$\text{CTR Criterion} = \left[\frac{m}{H_{rw}} \cdot \left(H_{eff} - H_{rw}\right) + 1\right] \cdot e^{m \cdot \ln(H_{rw}) + b} \qquad \text{(Equation 2)}$$

Where:

H_{eff} = effluent hardness
H_{rw} = upstream receiving water hardness
b = metal- and criterion-specific constant
m = metal- and criterion-specific constant

Therefore, for cadmium (acute), lead, and silver (acute) water quality criteria were calculated using Equation 2 with a lowest reported effluent hardness of 286 mg/L as $CaCO_3$ and a lowest reported receiving water hardness of 171 mg/L as $CaCO_3$.

c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.**

The State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order (WQO) No. 2002-0015, states that the use of the harmonic mean to determine flow rates is inappropriate for ephemeral streams where there is no consistent background dilution. The impact of considering a receiving stream to be ephemeral is that all limitations are “end of pipe” without any benefit of dilution. Since Salt Creek is an ephemeral stream, this Order contains “end of pipe” limitations, with no dilution credits.

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

b. CWA section 301 (b)(1) requires NPDES permits to include effluent limitations that achieve technology-based standards and any more stringent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. Water quality standards include Regional Water Board Basin Plan beneficial uses and narrative and numeric water quality objectives, State Water Board-adopted standards, and federal

TENTATIVE ORDER

standards, including the CTR and NTR. The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at III-8.00.) With regards to the narrative chemical constituents objective, the Basin Plan states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, "…*water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)*" in Title 22 of CCR. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: "*Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.*"

c. Federal regulations require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numerical water quality standard. Based on information submitted as part of the application, in studies, and as directed by monitoring and reporting programs, the Regional Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality standard for aluminum, ammonia, bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, bromoform, carbofuran, carbon tetrachloride, chlorine residual, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, chlorpyrifos, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, iron, manganese, methoxychlor, nitrate, persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides, pathogens, pH, salinity (chloride, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids), settleable solids, and toxicity. Water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) for these constituents are included in this Order.

d. 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.[2] 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.

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

[2] See, Order WQO 2001-16 (Napa) and Order WQO 2004-0013 (Yuba City)

TENTATIVE ORDER

f. **Aluminum.** USEPA developed National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria for protection of freshwater aquatic life for aluminum. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for aluminum are 87 µg/L and 750 µg/L, respectively. The Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level - Consumer Acceptance Limit for aluminum is 200 µg/L.

The MEC for aluminum was 302 µg/L, based on 4 samples collected between March 2002 and November 2002. Therefore, aluminum in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the acute and chronic aquatic life criteria.

Footnote L to the National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria summary table for aluminum indicates that the chronic aquatic life criterion is based on studies conducted under specific receiving water conditions with a low pH (6.5 to 6.8 pH units) and low hardness (<10 mg/L as $CaCO_3$). Monitoring data demonstrates that these conditions are not similar to those in Salt Creek, which consistently has an upstream pH greater than 7.0 and hardness concentrations ranging from 94 to 208 mg/L. Thus, it is unlikely that application of the chronic criterion of 87 µg/L is necessary to protect aquatic life in Salt Creek.

In the absence of an applicable chronic aquatic life criterion, the most stringent water quality criterion is the Secondary MCL - Consumer Acceptance Limit for aluminum of 200 µg/L. The discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Secondary MCL for aluminum. Based on input from the Department of Public Health (DPH) and the fact that secondary MCLs are designed to protect consumer acceptance, effluent limitations based on secondary MCLs are applied as an annual average concentration. An annual average effluent limitation of 200 µg/L for aluminum is included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan's numeric chemical constituents objective.

It is uncertain whether regulating the discharge based on the secondary MCL (200 µg/L as an annual average) would also be protective of the acute aquatic life criterion. Therefore, this Order also includes an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and a maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) of 374 µg/L and 750 µg/L, respectively, based on USEPA's National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life (see Table F-7 for WQBEL calculations).

In USEPA's *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum—1988* [EPA 440/5-86-008], USEPA states that "[a]*cid-soluble aluminum…is probably the best measurement at the present…*"; however, USEPA has not yet approved an acid-soluble test method for aluminum. Replacing the ICP/AES portion of the analytical procedure with ICP/MS would allow lower detection limits to be achieved. Based on USEPA's discussion of aluminum analytical methods, this

TENTATIVE ORDER

Order allows the use of the alternate aluminum testing protocol described above to meet monitoring requirements.

g. **Ammonia.** Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia. Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger does not currently use nitrification to remove ammonia from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream. Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. Discharges of ammonia would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Applying 40 CFR section122.44(d)(1)(vi)(B), it is appropriate to use USEPA's Ambient National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life for ammonia, which was developed to be protective of aquatic organisms.

USEPA's *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life*, for total ammonia, recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average, criteria continuous concentration) standards based on pH and temperature. It also recommends a maximum four-day average concentration of 2.5 times the criteria continuous concentration. USEPA found that as pH increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia increased. Salmonids were more sensitive to acute toxicity effects than other species. However, while the acute toxicity of ammonia was not influenced by temperature, it was found that invertebrates and young fish experienced increasing chronic toxicity effects with increasing temperature. USEPA's recommended criteria are show below:

$$CCC_{30-day} = \left(\frac{0.0577}{1+10^{7.688-pH}} + \frac{2.487}{1+10^{pH-7.688}} \right) \times MIN\left(2.85, 1.45 \cdot 10^{0.028(25-T)}\right), \text{ and}$$

$$CMC = \left(\frac{0.275}{1+10^{7.204-pH}} + \frac{39.0}{1+10^{pH-7.204}} \right),$$

where *T* is in degrees Celsius

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.5. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an organism, a pH value of 8.5 was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion is 2.14 mg/L.

Because Salt Creek is dominated by the effluent, the maximum observed rolling 30-day average temperature and the maximum observed pH of the effluent during the period when the maximum observed rolling 30-day average temperature occurred were used to calculate the 30-day CCC. The maximum observed effluent 30-day rolling average temperature was 27.6°C. The maximum observed effluent pH value during the period when the maximum observed rolling 30-day average temperature was 8.6.

TENTATIVE ORDER

Using a pH value of 8.6 and the highest temperature value of 27.6°C on a rolling 30-day basis, the resulting 30-day CCC is 0.4 mg/L (as N). The 4-day average concentration is derived in accordance with the USEPA criterion as 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. Based on a 30-day CCC of 0.4 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 1.0 mg/L (as N).

The MEC for ammonia was 32.2 mg/L. Therefore, ammonia in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a level necessary to protect aquatic life resulting in a violation of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

The SIP procedure assumes a 4-day averaging period for calculating the long term average discharge condition (LTA). However, USEPA recommends modifying the procedure for calculating permit limits for ammonia using a 30-day averaging period for the calculation of the LTA corresponding to the 30-day chronic criteria. Therefore, while the LTAs corresponding to the acute and 4-day chronic criteria were calculated according to SIP procedures, the LTA corresponding to the 30-day chronic criteria was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period. The lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day, and 30-day chronic criteria is then selected for deriving the AMEL and the MDEL. The remainder of the WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures.

This Order contains a final AMEL and MDEL for ammonia of 0.3 mg/L and 1.5 mg/L, respectively, based on USEPA's National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life and to assure the treatment process adequately nitrifies the waste stream to protect the aquatic habitat beneficial uses.

Based on the sample results in the effluent, it appears that the Discharger may be in immediate non-compliance upon issuance of the permit. New or modified control measures may be necessary in order to comply with the effluent limitations, and the new or modified control measures cannot be designed, installed and put into operation within 30 calendar days. The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins includes a provision that authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES permits for water quality objectives adopted after 25 September 1995 (See Basin Plan at page IV-16). The water quality-based effluent limitations for ammonia are based on a new interpretation of the narrative standard for protection of receiving water beneficial uses. Therefore, a compliance schedule for compliance with the ammonia effluent limitations is established in the Order.

An interim performance-based maximum daily effluent limitation of 13 mg/L has been established in this Order. The interim limitation was determined as described in Attachment F, Section IV.E.3., and is in effect through five years from the effective date of this Order. As part of the compliance schedule, this

TENTATIVE ORDER

Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final ammonia effluent limitations. In addition, the Discharger shall submit an engineering treatment feasibility study.

h. **Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate.** Bis (2-ethyl-hexyl) phthalate is used primarily as one of several plasticizers in polyvinyl chloride (PVC) resins for fabricating flexible vinyl products. According to the Consumer Product Safety Commission, USEPA, and the Food and Drug Administration, these PVC resins are used to manufacture many products, including soft squeeze toys, balls, raincoats, adhesives, polymeric coatings, components of paper and paperboard, defoaming agents, animal glue, surface lubricants, and other products that must stay flexible and noninjurious for the lifetime of their use. The State MCL for bis (2 ethylhexyl) phthalate is 4 µg/l and the USEPA MCL is 6 µg/l. The NTR criterion for Human health protection for consumption of water and aquatic organisms is 1.8 µg/l and for consumption of aquatic organisms only is 5.9 µg/l.

The presence of bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate can often be attributed to laboratory contamination. Therefore, effluent limitations are not being established at this time but monitoring is being required to determine if limitations are warranted in subsequent permits.

i. **Bromoform**. (see also subsection aa, Total Trihalomethanes) Based on information submitted by the Discharger, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR standards for bromoform. The CTR includes standards for the protection of human health based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for bromoform. Municipal and domestic supply is a beneficial use of the receiving stream. The standard for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed is 4.3 µg/L. The maximum observed effluent bromoform concentration was detected in an effluent sample at a concentration of 4.5 µg/L collected in July 2002. The observed MEC is greater than the water quality criteria; therefore, effluent limitations for bromoform are required.

Bromoform has not been analyzed for the receiving water. As result, no assimilative capacity for bromoform is available. This Order includes an AMEL and MDEL for bromoform of 4.3 µg/L and 8.6 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR standard for the protection of human health (See Attachment F, Table F-11 for WQBEL calculations).

The Discharger is unable to comply with these limitations. Section 2.1 of the SIP allows for compliance schedules within the permit for existing discharges where it is demonstrated that it is infeasible for a Discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion. Using the statistical methods for calculating interim effluent limitations described in Attachment F, Section IV.D.1., an interim performance-based maximum daily limitation of 14 µg/L was calculated.

Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that: "*Based on an existing discharger's request*

TENTATIVE ORDER

and demonstration that it is infeasible for the discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion, or with an effluent limitation based on a CTR criterion, the RWQCB may establish a compliance schedule in an NPDES permit." Section 2.1, further states that compliance schedules may be included in NPDES permits provided that the following justification has been submitted: …"*(a) documentation that diligent efforts have been made to quantify pollutant levels in the discharge and the sources of the pollutant in the waste stream; (b) documentation of source control measures and/or pollution minimization measures efforts currently underway or completed; (c) a proposal for additional or future source control measures, pollutant minimization actions, or waste treatment (i.e., facility upgrades); and (d) a demonstration that the proposed schedule is as short as practicable*." The Discharger provided this information on 29 June 2007. The new water quality-based effluent limitations for bromoform become effective on **18 May 2010**.

This Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final bromoform effluent limitations. The interim effluent limitations are in effect through **17 May 2010**. As part of the compliance schedule for bromoform, the Discharger shall develop a pollution prevention program in compliance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) and submit an engineering treatment feasibility study. The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

j. **Carbofuran.** The recommended instantaneous maximum for carbofuran is 0.5 µg/L based on interim National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria set by California Department of Fish and Game. Carbofuran was detected in an effluent sample collected March, 2002, at a concentration of 3.03 µg/L. This result was reported by the analytical laboratory as an estimated concentration (J flag). The concentration fell below the reporting limit (lowest quantifiable concentration) of 5 µg/L, but exceeded the method detection limit of 1.3 µg/L.
Effluent limitations are not being established at this time but monitoring is being required to determine if the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above any state water quality standard. If necessary, effluent limitations will be established in subsequent permits.

k. **Carbon Tetrachloride.** The CTR includes standards for the protection of human health based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for carbon tetrachloride. Municipal and domestic supply is a beneficial use of the receiving stream. The standard for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed is 0.25 µg/L. The maximum observed effluent carbon tetrachloride concentration was detected in an effluent sample at a concentration of 0.7 µg/L collected in July 2002. All other effluent samples (3 of 4) were non-detect.

Effluent limitations are not being established at this time but monitoring is being required to determine if the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause, or

TENTATIVE ORDER

contribute to an in-stream excursion above any state water quality standard. If necessary, effluent limitations will be established in subsequent permits.

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

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

The chlorine residual limitations required in this Order are protective of aquatic organisms in the undiluted discharge. If compliance is maintained, the Regional Water Board does not anticipate residual chlorine impacts to benthic organisms.

m. **Chlorodibromomethane.** (see also subsection aa, Total Trihalomethanes)The CTR includes a chlorodibromomethane criterion of 0.41 µg/L for the protection of human health and is based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed. The MEC for chlorodibromomethane was 40 µg/L, based on 4 samples collected between March 2002 and November 2002. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for chlorodibromomethane.

Chlorodibromomethane has not been analyzed for the receiving water. As result, no assimilative capacity for chlorodibromomethane is available. An AMEL and MDEL for chlorodibromomethane of 0.41 µg/L and 0.82 µg/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health (See Attachment F, Table F-13 for WQBEL calculations).

The Discharger is unable to comply with these limitations. Section 2.1 of the SIP allows for compliance schedules within the permit for existing discharges where it is demonstrated that it is infeasible for a Discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion. Using the statistical methods for calculating interim effluent limitations described in Attachment F, Section IV.D.1., an interim performance-based maximum daily limitation of 130 µg/L was calculated.

TENTATIVE ORDER

Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that: "*Based on an existing discharger's request and demonstration that it is infeasible for the discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion, or with an effluent limitation based on a CTR criterion, the RWQCB may establish a compliance schedule in an NPDES permit.*" Section 2.1, further states that compliance schedules may be included in NPDES permits provided that the following justification has been submitted: …"*(a) documentation that diligent efforts have been made to quantify pollutant levels in the discharge and the sources of the pollutant in the waste stream; (b) documentation of source control measures and/or pollution minimization measures efforts currently underway or completed; (c) a proposal for additional or future source control measures, pollutant minimization actions, or waste treatment (i.e., facility upgrades); and (d) a demonstration that the proposed schedule is as short as practicable*." The Discharger provided this information on 29 June 2007. The new water quality-based effluent limitations for chlorodibromomethane become effective on **18 May 2010**.

This Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final chlorodibromomethane effluent limitations. The interim effluent limitations are in effect through **17 May 2010**. As part of the compliance schedule for chlorodibromomethane, the Discharger shall develop a pollution prevention program in compliance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) and submit an engineering treatment feasibility study. The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

n. **Chloroform.** (see subsection aa, Total Trihalomethanes)

o. **Chlorpyrifos.** California Department of Fish & Game Water Quality Criteria recommends a maximum 1-hour average and 4-day average chlorpyrifos concentrations of 0.014 µg/L and 0.02 µg/L, respectively. Chlorpyrifos was detected in an effluent sample collected March, 2002, at a concentration of 1.0 µg/L. All other effluent samples (3 of 4) were non-detect.

   Effluent limitations are not being established at this time but monitoring is being required to determine if the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above any state water quality standard. If necessary, effluent limitations will be established in subsequent permits.

p. **Cyanide.** The CTR includes maximum 1-hour average and 4-day average cyanide concentrations of 22 µg/L and 5.2 µg/L, respectively, for the protection of freshwater aquatic life. The MEC for cyanide was 41 µg/L, based on 4 samples collected between March 2002 and November 2002. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for cyanide.

   Cyanide has not been analyzed for the receiving water. As result, no assimilative capacity for cyanide is available.

TENTATIVE ORDER

An AMEL and MDEL for cyanide of 4.3 µg/L and 8.5 µg/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life (See Attachment F, Table F-15 for WQBEL calculations).

The Discharger is unable to comply with these limitations. Section 2.1 of the SIP allows for compliance schedules within the permit for existing discharges where it is demonstrated that it is infeasible for a Discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion. Using the statistical methods for calculating interim effluent limitations described in Attachment F, Section IV.D.1., an interim performance-based maximum daily limitation of 130 µg/L was calculated.

Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that: "*Based on an existing discharger's request and demonstration that it is infeasible for the discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion, or with an effluent limitation based on a CTR criterion, the RWQCB may establish a compliance schedule in an NPDES permit.*" Section 2.1, further states that compliance schedules may be included in NPDES permits provided that the following justification has been submitted: …"*(a) documentation that diligent efforts have been made to quantify pollutant levels in the discharge and the sources of the pollutant in the waste stream; (b) documentation of source control measures and/or pollution minimization measures efforts currently underway or completed; (c) a proposal for additional or future source control measures, pollutant minimization actions, or waste treatment (i.e., facility upgrades); and (d) a demonstration that the proposed schedule is as short as practicable*." The Discharger provided this information on 29 June 2007. The new water quality-based effluent limitations for cyanide become effective on **18 May 2010**.

This Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final cyanide effluent limitations. The interim effluent limitations are in effect through **17 May 2010**. As part of the compliance schedule for cyanide, the Discharger shall develop a pollution prevention program in compliance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) and submit an engineering treatment feasibility study. The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

q. **Dichlorobromomethane.** (see also subsection aa, Total Trihalomethanes) The CTR includes a dichlorobromomethane criterion of 0.56 µg/L for the protection of human health and is based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed. The MEC for dichlorobromomethane was 104 µg/L, based on 4 samples collected between March 2002 and November 2002. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for dichlorobromomethane.

Dichlorobromomethane has not been analyzed for the receiving water. As result, no assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane is available.

TENTATIVE ORDER

An AMEL and MDEL for dichlorobromomethane of 0.56 µg/L and 1.1 µg/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health (See Attachment F, Table F-16 for WQBEL calculations).

The Discharger is unable to comply with these limitations. Section 2.1 of the SIP allows for compliance schedules within the permit for existing discharges where it is demonstrated that it is infeasible for a Discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion. Using the statistical methods for calculating interim effluent limitations described in Attachment F, Section IV.D.1., an interim performance-based maximum daily limitation of 320 µg/L was calculated.

Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that: "*Based on an existing discharger's request and demonstration that it is infeasible for the discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion, or with an effluent limitation based on a CTR criterion, the RWQCB may establish a compliance schedule in an NPDES permit.*" Section 2.1, further states that compliance schedules may be included in NPDES permits provided that the following justification has been submitted: …"*(a) documentation that diligent efforts have been made to quantify pollutant levels in the discharge and the sources of the pollutant in the waste stream; (b) documentation of source control measures and/or pollution minimization measures efforts currently underway or completed; (c) a proposal for additional or future source control measures, pollutant minimization actions, or waste treatment (i.e., facility upgrades); and (d) a demonstration that the proposed schedule is as short as practicable*." The Discharger provided this information on 29 June 2007. The new water quality-based effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane become effective on **18 May 2010**.

This Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final dichlorobromomethane effluent limitations. The interim effluent limitations are in effect through **17 May 2010**. As part of the compliance schedule for dichlorobromomethane, the Discharger shall develop a pollution prevention program in compliance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) and submit an engineering treatment feasibility study. The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

r. **Iron.** The Secondary MCL - Consumer Acceptance Limit for iron is 300 µg/L. The MEC for iron was 579 µg/L, based on 4 samples collected between March 2002 and November 2002. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Secondary MCL for iron. Iron has not been analyzed for the receiving water. As result, no assimilative capacity for iron is available. An annual average effluent limitation of 300 µg/L for iron is included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan's narrative chemical constituents objective. Based on the sample results in the effluent, it appears the Discharger can meet this new limitation.

TENTATIVE ORDER

An interim performance-based maximum daily effluent limitation of 1800 µg/L has been established in this Order. The interim limitation was determined as described in Attachment F, Section IV.E.3., and is in effect through five years from the effective date of this Order. As part of the compliance schedule, this Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final methoxychlor effluent limitations. In addition, the Discharger shall submit an engineering treatment feasibility study and prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan that is in compliance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

s. **Manganese.** The Secondary MCL - Consumer Acceptance Limit for manganese is 50 µg/L. The MEC for manganese was 115 µg/L, based on 4 samples collected between March 2002 and November 2002. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Secondary MCL for manganese. Manganese has not been analyzed for the receiving water. Therefore, no assimilative capacity is available in the receiving water for manganese. An annual average effluent limitation of 50 µg/L for manganese is included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan's narrative chemical constituents objective.

An interim performance-based maximum daily effluent limitation of 360 µg/L has been established in this Order. The interim limitation was determined as described in Attachment F, Section IV.E.3., and is in effect through five years from the effective date of this Order. As part of the compliance schedule, this Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final methoxychlor effluent limitations. In addition, the Discharger shall submit an engineering treatment feasibility study and prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan that is in compliance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

t. **Nitrate.** Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia. Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. Nitrate and nitrite are known to cause adverse health effects in humans. The California DPH has adopted Primary MCLs at Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Table 64431-A, for the protection of human health for nitrite and nitrate that are equal to 1 mg/L and 10 mg/L (measured as nitrogen), respectively. Title 22 CCR, Table 64431-A, also includes a primary MCL of 10,000 µg/L for the sum of nitrate and nitrite, measured as nitrogen.

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

organisms.

Inadequate or incomplete denitrification may result in the discharge of nitrate to the receiving stream. The conversion of ammonia to nitrites and the conversion of nitrites to nitrates present a reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCLs for nitrate. AMEL for nitrate of 10 mg/L is included in this Order based on the MCLs. This effluent limitation is included in this Order to assure the treatment process adequately nitrifies and denitrifies the waste stream to protect the beneficial use of municipal and domestic supply.

Based on the sample results in the effluent, the limitations appear to put the Discharger in immediate non-compliance. New or modified control measures may be necessary in order to comply with the effluent limitations, and the new or modified control measures cannot be designed, installed and put into operation within 30 calendar days. Furthermore, the effluent limitations for nitrate are a new regulatory requirement within this permit, which becomes applicable to the waste discharge with the adoption of this Order, which was adopted after 1 July 2000. An interim performance-based maximum daily effluent limitation of 47 mg/L has been established in this Order. The interim limitation was determined as described in Attachment F, Section IV.E.3., and is in effect through five years from the effective date of this Order. As part of the compliance schedule, this Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final nitrate effluent limitations. In addition, the Discharger shall submit an engineering treatment feasibility study.

t. **Persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides.** Heptachlor and methoxychlor were each detected one time in the effluent at concentrations of 0.04 µg/L and 0.11 µg/L, respectively. Heptachlor and methoxychlor are persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. Analytical results for all other persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides were non-detect. The Basin Plan requires that no individual pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses; total chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides shall not be present in the water column at detectable concentrations; and pesticide concentrations shall not exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies.

The CTR contains numeric criteria for heptachlor of 0.00021 µg/L, for freshwaters from which both water and organisms are consumed. Effluent limitations are not being established at this time but monitoring is being required to determine if the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above any state water quality standard. If necessary, effluent limitations will be established in subsequent permits.

TENTATIVE ORDER

u. **Pathogens**. The beneficial uses of the receiving water include municipal and domestic supply and water contact recreation, and there is less than 20:1 dilution of the Facility effluent provided by Salt Creek. To protect these beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board finds that the wastewater must be disinfected and adequately treated to prevent disease. The principal infectious agents (pathogens) that may be present in raw sewage may be classified into three broad groups: bacteria, parasites, and viruses. Tertiary treatment, consisting of chemical coagulation, sedimentation, and filtration, has been found to remove approximately 99.5% of viruses. Filtration is an effective means of reducing viruses and parasites from the waste stream. The wastewater must be treated to tertiary standards (filtered), or equivalent, to protect contact recreational uses.

DPH has developed reclamation criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22), for the reuse of wastewater. Title 22 requires that for spray irrigation of food crops, parks, playgrounds, schoolyards, and other areas of similar public access, wastewater be adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, and filtered, and that the effluent total coliform levels not exceed 2.2 MPN/100 ml as a 7-day median. As coliform organisms are living and mobile, it is impracticable to quantify an exact number of coliform organisms and to establish weekly average limitations. Instead, coliform organisms are measured as a most probable number and regulated based on a 7-day median limitation. In addition, the previous Order stated that in a 30-day period only a single sample may exceed 23 MPN/100 mL and no sample should exceed 240 MPN/100 mL. These effluent limitations are carried over in accordance with State and federal anti-backsliding regulations.

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

In addition to coliform testing, turbidity specifications have been included as a second indicator of the effectiveness of the treatment process and to assure compliance with the required level of treatment. The previous Order established effluent limitations for turbidity, including a weekly average of 2 nephelometric turbidity units (NTU), and a daily maximum of 10 NTU. The previous Order also

TENTATIVE ORDER

prohibited the effluent from exceeding 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time, and prohibited the effluent from exceeding 10 NTU at any given time if the effluent was continuously monitored. Failure of the filtration system such that virus removal is impaired would normally result in increased particles in the effluent, which result in higher effluent turbidity. Turbidity has a major advantage for monitoring filter performance, allowing immediate detection of filter failure and rapid corrective action. Coliform testing, by comparison, is not conducted continuously and requires several hours, to days, to identify high coliform concentrations. The limitations in the previous Order were solely an operational check to ensure the treatment system was functioning properly and could meet the limits for total coliform organisms. The effluent limitations were not intended to regulate turbidity in the receiving water. Rather, turbidity should be an operational parameter to determine proper system function and not a WQBEL. Therefore, to ensure compliance with the DPH recommended Title 22 disinfection criteria, this Order contains operational turbidity specifications to be met prior to disinfection in lieu of effluent limitations.

To be consistent with current DPH guidance the operational requirements for turbidity have been established as 2 NTU as a daily average, an instantaneous maximum of 10 NTU, and shall not exceed 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time.This Order contains effluent limitations and requires a tertiary level of treatment, or equivalent, necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The Regional Water Board has previously considered the factors in CWC section 13241.

v. **pH.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the "…*pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5. Changes in normal ambient pH levels shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh waters with designated COLD or WARM beneficial uses.*" Effluent Limitations for pH are included in this Order based on the Basin Plan objectives for pH.

w. **Salinity.** The discharge contains total dissolved solids (TDS), chloride, and electrical conductivity (EC). These are water quality parameters that are indicative of the salinity of the water. Their presence in water can be growth limiting to certain agricultural crops and can affect the taste of water for human consumption. There are no USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic organisms for these constituents. The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates State MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for EC, TDS, and chloride.

Table F-5. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives

Parameter	Units	Agricultural WQ Goal[1]	Secondary MCL[3]	Effluent	
				Average	Maximum
Chloride	mg/L	Varies[2]	250, 500, 600	217	234

TENTATIVE ORDER

EC	µmhos/cm	Varies[2]	900, 1600, 2200	1839	2060
TDS	mg/L	Varies[2]	500, 1000, 1500	1090	1150

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

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

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

i. **Chloride**. The secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as 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.

Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 182 mg/L to 234 mg/L, with an average of 217 mg/L, for 4 samples collected by the Discharger from March 2002 through November 2002.

ii. **Electrical Conductivity (EC)**. The secondary MCL for EC is 900 µmhos/cm as a recommended level, 1600 µmhos/cm as an upper level, and 2200 µmhos/cm as a short-term maximum. The agricultural water quality goal, that would fully protect the agricultural beneficial use, is 700 µmhos/cm as a long-term average based on Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985). 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 700 µmhos/cm agricultural water quality goal is intended to prevent reduction in crop yield, i.e. a restriction on use of water, for salt-sensitive crops, such as beans, carrots, turnips, and strawberries. 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 United Nations report indicates that site-specific factors, such as rainfall and flooding, may be considered in determining protective EC levels in irrigation water.

TENTATIVE ORDER

A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports from January 2003 through May 2005 and the priority pollutants reports in 2002 shows an average effluent EC of 1838 µmhos/cm, with a range from 1342 µmhos/cm to 2060. These levels exceed the applicable objectives. The background receiving water EC averaged 567 µmhos/cm in 125 sampling events collected by the Discharger from January 2003 through May 2005.

To protect the receiving water from further salinity degradation, an interim performance-based annual average EC effluent limitation of 2300 umhos/cm is included in this Order. The interim limitation was determined as described in Attachment F, Section IV.E.1. This Order requires the Discharger to conduct site-specific studies to determine the appropriate EC level to protect beneficial uses. It is the intent of the Regional Water Board to include a final EC effluent limitation in a subsequent permit renewal or amendment, based on the results of approved site-specific studies.

iii. **Total Dissolved Solids (TDS).** The secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum. The recommended agricultural water quality goal for TDS is 450 mg/L as a long-term average based on Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985). Water Quality for Agriculture evaluates the impacts of salinity levels on crop tolerance and yield reduction, and establishes water quality goals that are protective of the agricultural uses. The 450 mg/L water quality goal is intended to prevent reduction in crop yield, i.e. a restriction on use of water, for salt-sensitive crops. Only the most salt sensitive crops require irrigation water of 450 mg/L or less to prevent loss of yield. Most other crops can tolerate higher TDS concentrations without harm, however, as the salinity of the irrigation water increases, more crops are potentially harmed by the TDS, or extra measures must be taken by the farmer to minimize or eliminate any harmful impacts.

The average TDS effluent concentration was 1090 mg/L and ranged from 1030 mg/L to 1150 mg/L for 4 samples collected by the Discharger from March 2002 through November 2002. These concentrations exceed the applicable water quality objectives.

The TDS effluent concentration varied with the level of EC in the effluent, at a ratio of approximately 60 percent. At this ratio, the percent reduction in EC necessary to achieve 700 umhos/cm was greater than the percent reduction in TDS necessary to achieve 450 mg/L. Since the TDS is directly related to the EC, this Order contains a performance based effluent limitation for EC instead of TDS.

x. **Settleable Solids.** For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states that "[w]ater shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of

TENTATIVE ORDER

material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses." This Order contains average monthly and daily maximum effluent limitations for settleable solids. Order No. 5-01-049 contains effluent limitations for settleable solids. This Order carries over a monthly average effluent limitation of 0.1 mL/L and a daily maximum of 0.2 mL/L.

Because the amount of settleable solids is measured in terms of volume per volume without a mass component, it is impracticable to calculate mass limitations for inclusion in this Order. A daily maximum effluent limitation for settleable solids is included in the Order, in lieu of a weekly average, to ensure that the treatment works operate in accordance with design capabilities.

y. **Total Trihalomethanes (THMs).** Information submitted by the Discharger indicates that the effluent contains THMs, including bromoform, chloroform, dichlorobromomethane, and chlorodibromomethane. The Basin Plan contains the narrative "chemical constituent" objective that requires, at a minimum, that waters with a designated MUN use not exceed California MCLs. In addition, the chemical constituent objective prohibits chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. The California primary MCL for total THMs is 100 µg/L. The USEPA primary MCL for total THMs is 80 µg/L, which was effective on 1 January 2002 for surface water systems that serve more than 10,000 people. Pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act, DPH must revise the current total THMs MCL in Title 22, CCR to be as low or lower than the USEPA MCL. Total THMs include bromoform, dichlorobromomethane, chloroform, and chlorodibromomethane. The Cal/EPA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has published the Toxicity Criteria Database, which contains cancer potency factors for chemicals, including chloroform, that have been used as a basis for regulatory actions by the regional boards, departments, and offices within Cal/EPA. This cancer potency factor is equivalent to a chloroform concentration in drinking water of 1.1 µg/L (ppb) at the 1-in-a-million cancer risk level with an average daily consumption of two liters of drinking water over a 70-year lifetime. This risk level is consistent with that used by the DPH to set de minimis risks from involuntary exposure to carcinogens in drinking water in developing MCLs and Action Levels, and by OEHHA to set negligible cancer risks in developing Public Health Goals for drinking water. The one-in-a-million cancer risk level is also mandated by USEPA in applying human health protective criteria contained in the NTR and the CTR to priority toxic pollutants in California surface waters.

MUN is a designated beneficial use of the receiving water. However, there are no known drinking water intakes in Salt Creek for several miles downstream of the discharge, and chloroform is a non-conservative pollutant. Therefore, to protect the MUN use of the receiving waters, the Regional Water Board finds that, in this specific circumstance, application of the USEPA MCL for total THMs for the effluent is appropriate, as long as the receiving water does not exceed the OEHHA cancer potency factor's equivalent receiving water concentration at a reasonable distance from the outfall. Effluent samples collected from

TENTATIVE ORDER

March 2002 through November 2002 indicate that THMs were present with a maximum concentration of 426.9 µg/L and an average concentration of 150 µg/L. Chloroform samples collected over the same period contained a maximum concentration of 278 µg/L and an average concentration of 84 µg/L. Therefore, total THMs in the discharge have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the USEPA primary MCL for total THMs. Total trihalomethanes has not been analyzed for the receiving water. As result, no assimilative capacity for total trihalomethanes is available. An AMEL of 80 µg/L for total THMs is included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan's narrative chemical constituents objective.

Based on the sample results in the effluent, the limitations appear to put the Discharger in immediate non-compliance. New or modified control measures may be necessary in order to comply with the effluent limitations, and the new or modified control measures cannot be designed, installed and put into operation within 30 calendar days. Furthermore, the effluent limitations for total trihalomethanes are a new regulatory requirement within this permit, which becomes applicable to the waste discharge with the adoption of this Order, which was adopted after 1 July 2000. Interim performance-based maximum daily effluent limitations of 14 µg/L, 130 ug/L, 860 ug/L, and 320 ug/L for bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, and dichlorobromomethane, respectively, has been established in this Order. The interim limitations were determined as described in Attachment F, Section IV.E.3., and are in effect through 17 May 2010. As part of the compliance schedule, this Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final methoxychlor effluent limitations. In addition, the Discharger shall submit an engineering treatment feasibility study and prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan that is in compliance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The Pollution Prevention Plan required herein is not incorporated by reference into this Order.

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

4. WQBEL Calculations

a. Effluent limitations for aluminum, ammonia, bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chlorpyrifos, cyanide, and dichlorobromomethane were calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The following paragraphs describe the methodology used for calculating effluent limitations.

b. **Effluent Limitation Calculations.** In calculating maximum effluent limitations, the effluent concentration allowances were set equal to the criteria/standards/objectives.

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

where:

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

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

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

CMC = criteria maximum concentration (one-hour average)

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

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

D = dilution credit

B = maximum receiving water concentration

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

Human health ECAs are set equal to the AMEL and a statistical multiplier is used to calculate the MDEL.

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

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

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

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

Water quality-based effluent limitations were calculated for aluminum, ammonia, bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chlorpyrifos, cyanide, and dichlorobromomethane as follows in Tables F-9 through F-16, below.

TENTATIVE ORDER

Table F-6. WQBEL Calculations for Ammonia

	Acute	Chronic
pH [1]	8.5	8.6
Temperature °C [2]	N/A	27.6
Criteria (mg/L) [3]	2.14	0.4
Dilution Credit	No Dilution	No Dilution
ECA	2.14	0.4
ECA Multiplier	0.16	0.59
LTA	0.34	0.24
AMEL Multiplier (95th%)	[5]	1.43
AMEL (mg/L)	[5]	**0.3**
MDEL Multiplier (99th%)	[5]	6.21
MDEL (mg/L)	[5]	**1.5**

(1) Acute design pH = 8.5 (max. allowed effluent pH), Chronic design pH = highest reported pH
(2) Temperature = Maximum 30-day average effluent temperature
(3) USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria
(4) LTA developed based on Acute and Chronic ECA Multipliers calculated at 99th percentile level per sections 5.4.1 and 5.5.4 of TSD.
(5) Limitations based on chronic LTA ($LTA_{acute} > LTA_{chronic}$)

Table F-7. WQBEL Calculations for Bromoform

	Acute / Chronic	Human Health
Criteria (µg/L)	N/A	4.3
Dilution Credit	N/A	No Dilution
ECA	N/A	4.3
AMEL (µg/L) [1]	N/A	**4.3**
MDEL/AMEL Multiplier[2]	N/A	2.01
MDEL (µg/L)	N/A	**8.6**

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

Table F-8. WQBEL Calculations for Chlorodibromomethane

	Acute	Chronic
Criteria (µg/L)	N/A	0.41
Dilution Credit	N/A	No Dilution
ECA	N/A	0.41
AMEL (µg/L) [1]	N/A	**0.41**
MDEL/AMEL Multiplier[2]	N/A	2.01
MDEL (µg/L)	N/A	**0.82**

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

Table F-9. WQBEL Calculations for Cyanide

	Acute	Chronic
Criteria (µg/L) [1]	22	5.2
Dilution Credit	No Dilution	No Dilution

TENTATIVE ORDER

ECA	22	5.2
ECA Multiplier	0.32	0.53
LTA	7.06	2.74
AMEL Multiplier (95th%)	(2)	1.55
AMEL (µg/L)	(2)	**4.3**
MDEL Multiplier (99th%)	(2)	3.11
MDEL (µg/L)	(2)	**8.5**

(1) California Toxics Rule Criteria
(2) Limitations based on chronic LTA (Chronic LTA < Acute LTA)

Table F-10. WQBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane

	Acute / Chronic	Human Health
Criteria (mg/L)	N/A	0.56
Dilution Credit	N/A	No Dilution
ECA	N/A	0.56
AMEL (mg/L) (1)	N/A	**0.56**
MDEL/AMEL Multiplier(2)	N/A	2.01
MDEL (mg/L)	N/A	**1.1**

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

Table F-11. Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	374	--	750	--	--
Ammonia (as N)	µg/L	0.3	--	1.5	--	--
Bromoform	µg/L	4.3	--	8.6	--	--
Chloro-dibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	--	0.82	--	--
Chloroform	µg/L	80	--	160	--	--
Cyanide	µg/L	4.3	--	8.5	--	--
Dichloro-bromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	10	--	--	--	--
Trihalomethanes [2, 3]	µg/L	80	--	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Settleable Solids	mL/L-hr	0.1	--	0.2	--	--

1 Based on a design flow of 0.5 mgd.
2 Reported as Total.
3 Trihalomethanes include bromoform, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane.

TENTATIVE ORDER

TENTATIVE ORDER

5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

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

a. **Acute Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, "…*effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate*…". USEPA Region 9 provided guidance for the development of acute toxicity effluent limitations in the absence of numeric water quality objectives for toxicity in its document titled "Guidance for NPDES Permit Issuance", dated February 1994. In section B.2. "Toxicity Requirements" (pgs. 14-15) it states that, "*In the absence of specific numeric water quality objectives for acute and chronic toxicity, the narrative criterion 'no toxics in toxic amounts' applies. Achievement of the narrative criterion, as applied herein, means that ambient waters shall not demonstrate for acute toxicity: 1) less than 90% survival, 50% of the time, based on the monthly median, or 2) less than 70% survival, 10% of the time, based on any monthly median. 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 bioassays ----------	70%
Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays ---------	90%

b. **Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." (Basin Plan at III-8.00) Adequate WET data is not available to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Attachment E of this Order requires semi-annual chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective.

In addition to WET monitoring, Special Provisions VI.C.2.a. requires the Discharger to submit to the Regional Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE

Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger and requirements for accelerated monitoring, as well as, requirements for TRE initiation if a pattern of toxicity is demonstrated.

TENTATIVE ORDER

D. Final Effluent Limitations

1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations.

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

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the permitted average daily discharge flow allowed in Section IV.A.1. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations.

Title 40 CFR 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) unless impracticable. However, for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting, the US EPA 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 ammonia, aluminum, chlorine residual[3], iron, manganese, dichlorobromomethane, chlorodibromomethane, and dissolved oxygen as recommended by the TSD for the achievement of water quality standards and for the protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. Furthermore, for BOD, TSS, pH, coliform, and turbidity, weekly average effluent limitations have been replaced or supplemented with effluent limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. The rationale for using shorter

[3] This Order applies the USEPA National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for chlorine directly as effluent limitations (1 hour average, acute, and 4-day average, chronic). See Section IV.C.3., above, for rational regarding the chlorine residual effluent limitations.

averaging periods for these constituents is discussed in Attachment F, Section IV.C.3., above.

3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.

The previous Order contained effluent limitations for turbidity. The limitations were solely an operational check to ensure the treatment system was functioning properly and could meet the limits for total coliform organisms. The effluent limitations were not intended to regulate turbidity in the receiving water. Rather, turbidity is an operational parameter to determine proper system functioning and not a WQBEL.

This Order contains operational requirements for turbidity to be met prior to disinfection in lieu of effluent limitations. However, the operational requirements in this Order are an equivalent limitation that is not less stringent than the effluent limitations required in the Previous Order, and therefore does not constitute backsliding.

The revision in the turbidity limitation is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16 because this Order imposes equivalent or more stringent requirements than Order No. R5-2002-0083 and therefore does not allow degradation.

4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy

The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

Table F-12. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	40	63	83	--	--
TSS	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
	lbs/day[1]	40	63	83	--	--
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	374	--	750	--	--
Ammonia (as N)	µg/L	0.3	--	1.5	--	--
Bromoform	µg/L	4.3	--	8.6	--	--
Chloro-dibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	--	0.82	--	--
Chloroform	µg/L	80	--	160	--	--
Cyanide	µg/L	4.3	--	8.5	--	--
Dichloro-bromomethane	µg/L	0.56	--	1.12	--	--
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	10	--	--	--	--

TENTATIVE ORDER

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Trihalomethanes [2, 3]	µg/L	80	--	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Settleable Solids	mL/L-hr	0.1	--	0.2	--	--

[1] Based on a design flow of 0.5 mgd.

[2] Reported as Total.

[3] Trihalomethanes include bromoform, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane.

Mercury. The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.0014 lbs/month.

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

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

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

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

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

Turbidity. Effluent turbidity shall not exceed:

2 NTU, as a daily average; and
5 NTU, more than 5% of the time within a 24-hour period; and
10 NTU, at any time.

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

2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and
240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

Iron, Total Recoverable. For a calendar year, the annual average effluent concentration shall not exceed 300 µg/L.

Manganese, Total Recoverable. For a calendar year, the annual average effluent concentration shall not exceed 50 µg/L.

Aluminum, Total Recoverable. For a calendar year, the annual average effluent concentration shall not exceed 200 µg/L.

TENTATIVE ORDER

Average Dry Weather Flow. The ADWF shall not exceed 0.5 mgd.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations

1. **Ammonia, Bromoform, Chlorodibromomethane, Chloroform, Cyanide, Dichlorobromomethane, Iron, Manganese, and Nitrate.** The SIP, section 2.2.1, requires that if a compliance schedule is granted for a CTR or NTR constituent, the Regional Water Board shall establish interim requirements and dates for their achievement in the NPDES permit. The interim limitations must be based on current treatment plant performance or existing permit limitations, whichever is more stringent. The State Water Board has held that the SIP may be used as guidance for non-CTR constituents. Therefore, the SIP requirement for interim effluent limitations has been applied to both CTR and non-CTR constituents in this Order.

   The interim limitations for ammonia, bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, iron, manganese, and nitrate in this Order are based on the current treatment plant performance. In developing the interim limitation, where there are ten sampling data points or more, sampling and laboratory variability is accounted for by establishing interim limits that are based on normally distributed data where 99.9% of the data points will lie within 3.3 standard deviations of the mean (*Basic Statistical Methods for Engineers and Scientists, Kennedy and Neville, Harper and Row*). Therefore, the interim limitations in this Order are established as the mean plus 3.3 standard deviations of the available data.

   When there are less than ten sampling data points available, the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality- Based Toxics Control* ((EPA/505/2-90-001), TSD) recommends a coefficient of variation of 0.6 be utilized as representative of wastewater effluent sampling. The TSD recognizes that a minimum of ten data points is necessary to conduct a valid statistical analysis. The multipliers contained in Table 5-2 of the TSD are used to determine a maximum daily limitation based on a long-term average objective. In this case, the long-term average objective is to maintain, at a minimum, the current plant performance level. Therefore, when there are less than ten sampling points for a constituent, interim limitations are based on 3.11 times the maximum observed effluent concentration to obtain the daily maximum interim limitation (TSD, Table 5-2).

   The Regional Water Board finds that the Discharger can undertake source control and treatment plant measures to maintain compliance with the interim limitations included in this Order. Interim limitations are established when compliance with effluent limitations cannot be achieved by the existing discharge. Discharge of constituents in concentrations in excess of the final effluent limitations, but in compliance with the interim effluent limitations, can significantly degrade water quality and adversely affect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream on a long-term basis. The interim limitations, however, establish an enforceable ceiling concentration until compliance with the effluent limitation can be achieved.

TENTATIVE ORDER

Table F-13 summarizes the calculations of the interim effluent limitations for ammonia, bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, iron, manganese, and nitrate:

Table F-13. Interim Effluent Limitation Calculation Summary

Parameter	MEC µg/L	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Samples	Interim Limitation
Ammonia	19	2.43	3.2	>10	13
Bromoform	4.5	1.84	1.95	4	14
Chlorodibromomethane	40.4	20.95	13.12	4	130
Chloroform	278	84	129.64	4	860
Cyanide	41	16.8	16.02	5	130
Dichlorobromomethane	104	43.1	40.87	4	320
Iron	579	373	170	4	1800
Manganese	115	95.95	34.70	4	360
Nitrate	15	9.00	5.19	4	47
Note: All values are in µg/L.					

2. **BOD, TSS, and Total Coliform Organisms.** The Discharger is required to comply with the schedule for compliance established in Time Schedule Order R5-2007-0096.

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

1. CWA section 303(a-c), requires states to adopt water quality standards, including criteria where they are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Regional Water Board adopted water quality criteria as water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan states that "*[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses*." The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains Receiving Surface Water Limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for biostimulatory substances, chemical constituents, color, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, salinity, sediment, settleable material, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, turbidity, and electrical conductivity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

g. **Oil and Grease**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]aters shall not contain oils, greases, waxes, or other materials in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for oil and grease are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

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

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

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

j. **Radioactivity**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[R]adionuclides shall not be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal or aquatic life."* The Basin Plan states further that *"[A]t a minimum, waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of radionuclides in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations…"* Receiving Water Limitations for radioactivity are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

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

n. **Taste and Odors**. The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *"[W]ater shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses."* Receiving Water Limitations for taste- or odor-producing substances are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

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

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

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

- *Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs), increases shall not exceed 1 NTU.*
- *Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 20 percent.*

TENTATIVE ORDER

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

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

B. Groundwater

1. The beneficial uses of the 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 groundwaters 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.

3. Groundwater limitations are required to protect the beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater.

VI. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order, establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this facility.

A. Influent Monitoring

TENTATIVE ORDER

1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (*e.g.*, BOD and TSS reduction requirements).

B. Effluent Monitoring

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR §122.44(i)(2) effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations. Effluent monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with effluent limitations, assess the effectiveness of the treatment process, and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream and groundwater.

2. The SIP states that if "…*all reported detection limits of the pollutant in the effluent are greater than or equal to the C* [water quality criterion or objective] *value, the RWQCB* [Regional Water Board] *shall establish interim requirements…that require additional monitoring for the pollutant….*" All reported detection limits for constituents are greater than or equal to corresponding applicable water quality criteria or objectives. Monitoring for these constituents has been included in this Order in accordance with the SIP.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

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

2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Semi-annually chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring

1. Surface Water

a. Receiving water monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.

2. Groundwater

a. Section 13267 of the California Water Code states, in part, *"(a) A Regional Water Board, in establishing…waste discharge requirements… may investigate the quality of any waters of the state within its region*" and *"(b) (1) In conducting an investigation…, the Regional Water Board may require that any person who… discharges… waste…that could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the Regional Water Board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports*." The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be

TENTATIVE ORDER

obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the Regional Water Board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) is issued pursuant to California Water Code Section 13267. The groundwater monitoring and reporting program required by this Order and the Monitoring and Reporting Program are necessary to assure compliance with these waste discharge requirements. The Discharger is responsible for the discharges of waste at the facility subject to this Order.

b. Monitoring of the groundwater must be conducted to determine if the discharge has caused an increase in constituent concentrations, when compared to background. The monitoring must, at a minimum, require a complete assessment of groundwater impacts including the vertical and lateral extent of degradation, an assessment of all wastewater-related constituents which may have migrated to groundwater, an analysis of whether additional or different methods of treatment or control of the discharge are necessary to provide best practicable treatment or control to comply with Resolution No. 68-16. Economic analysis is only one of many factors considered in determining best practicable treatment or control. If monitoring indicates that the discharge has incrementally increased constituent concentrations in groundwater above background, this permit may be reopened and modified. Until groundwater monitoring is sufficient, this Order contains Groundwater Limitations that allow groundwater quality to be degraded for certain constituents when compared to background groundwater quality, but not to exceed water quality objectives. If groundwater quality has been degraded by the discharge, the incremental change in pollutant concentration (when compared with background) may not be increased. If groundwater quality has been or may be degraded by the discharge, this Order may be reopened and specific numeric limitations established consistent with Resolution 68-16 and the Basin Plan.

c. This Order requires the Discharger to continue groundwater monitoring and includes a regular schedule of groundwater monitoring in the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program. The groundwater monitoring reports are necessary to evaluate impacts to waters of the State to assure protection of beneficial uses and compliance with Regional Board plans and policies, including Resolution 68-16. Evidence in the record includes effluent monitoring data that indicates the presence of constituents that may degrade groundwater and surface water.

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Biosolids Monitoring

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

TENTATIVE ORDER

groundwater degradation.

2. **Water Supply Monitoring**

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

VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

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

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

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

a. **Pollution Prevention.** This Order requires the Discharger prepare pollution prevention plans following CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). This reopener provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for these constituents based on a review of the pollution prevention plans.

b. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a 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.

TENTATIVE ORDER

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." (Basin Plan at III-8.00.) Adequate WET data is not available to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Attachment E of this Order requires Quarterly 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 an Initial Investigative TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger and requirements for accelerated monitoring, as well as, requirements for TRE initiation if a pattern of toxicity is demonstrated.

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

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

The provision requires accelerated monitoring consisting of four chronic toxicity tests every 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

TENTATIVE ORDER

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-X), 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 Work Plan in accordance with USEPA guidance. Numerous guidance documents are available, as identified below:

- *Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants,* (EPA/833B-99/002), August 1999.
- Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial TREs*, (EPA/600/2-88/070), April 1989.*
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures,* Second Edition, EPA 600/6-91/005F, February 1991.
- *Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I*, EPA 600/6-91/005F, May 1992.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase II Toxicity Identification Procedures for Samples Exhibiting acute and Chronic Toxicity,* Second Edition, EPA 600/R-92/080, September 1993.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase III Toxicity Confirmation Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity*, Second Edition, EPA 600/R-92/081, September 1993.
- *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms*, Fifth Edition, EPA-821-R-02-012, October 2002.
- *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms*, Fourth Edition, EPA-821-R-02-013, October 2002.
- *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991*

TENTATIVE ORDER

Figure F-3
WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart



TENTATIVE ORDER

b. **Groundwater Monitoring (Special Provisions VI.C.2.d.).** To determine compliance with Groundwater Limitations V.B., the Discharger is required to evaluate the adequacy of its groundwater monitoring network. This provision requires the Discharger to evaluate its groundwater monitoring network to ensure there are one or more background monitoring wells and a sufficient number of designated monitoring wells downgradient of every treatment, storage, and disposal unit that does or may release waste constituents to groundwater. Currently, there are no groundwater monitoring wells downgradient of the unlined sludge drying beds and lined aerated lagoons. The Discharger must install new groundwater monitoring wells, if necessary, collect one year of monitoring data, and submit a report evaluating the underlying groundwater by **<DATE>**. If the monitoring shows that any constituent concentrations are increased above background water quality, by **<DATE>**, the Discharger shall submit a technical report describing the groundwater evaluation report results and critiquing each evaluated facility component with respect to BPTC and minimizing the discharge's impact on groundwater quality.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** In accordance with 40 CFR §122.44(k), the Discharger is required to implement best management practices to reduce the discharge of salinity to the Feather River. Particularly an Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity is required in this Order to ensure adequate measures are developed and implemented by the Discharger.

b. **CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) Pollution Prevention Plans.** The pollution prevention plans required for ammonia, cyanide, iron, manganese, nitrate, and total trihalomethanes shall, at minimum, meet the requirements outlined in CWC section 13263.3(d)(3). The minimum requirements for the pollution prevention plans include the following:

i. An estimate of all of the sources of a pollutant contributing, or potentially contributing, to the loadings of a pollutant in the treatment plant influent.

ii. An analysis of the methods that could be used to prevent the discharge of the pollutants into the Facility, including application of local limits to industrial or commercial dischargers regarding pollution prevention techniques, public education and outreach, or other innovative and alternative approaches to reduce discharges of the pollutant to the Facility. The analysis also shall identify sources, or potential sources, not within the ability or authority of the Discharger to control, such as pollutants in the potable water supply, airborne pollutants, pharmaceuticals, or pesticides, and estimate the magnitude of those sources, to the extent feasible.

iii. An estimate of load reductions that may be attained through the methods identified in subparagraph ii.

iv. A plan for monitoring the results of the pollution prevention program.

TENTATIVE ORDER

v. A description of the tasks, cost, and time required to investigate and implement various elements in the pollution prevention plan.

vi. A statement of the Discharger's pollution prevention goals and strategies, including priorities for short-term and long-term action, and a description of the Discharger's intended pollution prevention activities for the immediate future.

vii. A description of the Discharger's existing pollution prevention programs.

viii. An analysis, to the extent feasible, of any adverse environmental impacts, including cross-media impacts or substitute chemicals that may result from the implementation of the pollution prevention program.

ix. An analysis, to the extent feasible, of the costs and benefits that may be incurred to implement the pollution prevention program.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. **Pretreatment Requirements.**

i. The Federal Clean Water Act, Section 307(b), and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR Part 403, require publicly owned treatment works to develop an acceptable industrial pretreatment program. A pretreatment program is required to prevent the introduction of pollutants, which will interfere with treatment plant operations or sludge disposal, and prevent pass through of pollutants that exceed water quality objectives, standards or permit limitations. Pretreatment requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 403.

ii. The Discharger shall implement and enforce its approved pretreatment program and is an enforceable condition of this Order. If the Discharger fails to perform the pretreatment functions, the Regional Water Board, the State Water Board or the U.S. EPA may take enforcement actions against the Discharger as authorized by the CWA.

6. Other Special Provisions

7. Compliance Schedules

The use and location of compliances schedules in the permit depends on the Discharger's ability to comply and the source of the applied water quality criteria.

a. The Discharger submitted a request, and justification, within 90 days of the effective date of this Order, for a compliance schedule for aluminum, carbofuran,

TENTATIVE ORDER

chlorpyrifos, iron, manganese, and nitrate. The compliance schedule justification included all items specified in Paragraph 3, items (a) through (d), of Section 2.1 of the SIP. This Order establishes a compliance schedule for the new, final, water quality-based effluent limitations for aluminum, carbofuran, chlorpyrifos, iron, manganese, and nitrate and requires full compliance by five years from the effective date of this Order.

b. The Discharger submitted a request, and justification, within 90 days of the effective date of this Order**,** for a compliance schedule for bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, heptachlor and methoxychlor. The compliance schedule justification included all items specified in Paragraph 3, items (a) through (d), of Section 2.1 of the SIP. This Order establishes a compliance schedule for the new, final, water quality-based effluent limitations for bromoform, carbon tetrachloride, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, heptachlor and methoxychlor and requires full compliance by 18 May 2010.

TENTATIVE ORDER

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Water Board) is considering the issuance of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the Williams Wastewater Treatment 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 by posting in public areas (the nearest courthouse or city hall), the post office nearest the Facility, and near the entrance of the Facility by 19 September 2008.

B. Written Comments

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

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, written comments should be received at the Regional Water Board offices by 5:00 p.m. on 15 October 2008.

TENTATIVE ORDER

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: 4/5 December 2008
Time: 8:30 am
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

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

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

D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions

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

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

E. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge (RWD), related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special provisions, comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Regional Water Board by calling (916) 464-3291.

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 Mr. Ken Landau at (916) 464-4726.

TENTATIVE ORDER

ATTACHMENT G – STANDARD MONITORING WELL PROVISIONS

Prior to installation of groundwater monitoring wells, the Discharger shall submit a work plan containing at least the information specified in this document. Wells may be installed after the executive officer's approval of the work plan. Upon installation of the monitoring wells, the Discharger shall submit a report of results, as described below. A registered geologist, certified engineering geologist, or civil engineer registered or certified by the State of California must sign all work plans and reports.

I. MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION WORK PLAN

A. **General Information**:

1. Monitoring well locations and rationale
2. Survey details
3. Equipment decontamination procedures
4. Health and safety plan
5. Topographic map showing any existing monitoring wells, proposed wells, waste handling facilities, utilities, and other major physical and man-made features.

B. **Drilling Details**:

1. Describe drilling and logging methods

C. **Monitoring Well Design**:

1. Casing diameter
2. Borehole diameter
3. Depth of surface seal
4. Well construction materials
5. Diagram of well construction
6. Type of well cap
7. Size of perforations and rationale
8. Grain size of sand pack and rationale
9. Thickness and position of bentonite seal and sand pack
10. Depth of well, length and position of perforated interval

D. **Well Development**:

1. Method of development to be used
2. Method of determining when development is complete
3. Method of development water disposal

E. **Surveying Details**:

1. Discuss how each well will be surveyed to a common reference point

F. **Soil Sampling** (if applicable):

1. Cuttings disposal method
2. Analyses to be run and methods
3. Sample collection and preservation method
4. Intervals at which soil samples are to be collected
5. Number of soil samples to be analyzed and rationale
6. Location of soil samples and rationale
7. QA/QC procedures

G. **Well Sampling**:

1. Minimum time after development before sampling (48 hours)
2. Well purging method and amount of purge water
3. Sample collection and preservation method
4. QA/QC procedures

H. **Water Level Measurement**:

1. The elevation reference point at each monitoring well shall be within 0.01 foot.
2. Ground surface elevation at each monitoring well shall be within 0.1 foot.
3. Method and time of water level measurement shall be specified.

I. **Proposed time schedule for work**.

II. MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION REPORT OF RESULTS

A. **Well Construction**:

1. Number and depth of wells drilled
2. Date(s) wells drilled
3. Description of drilling and construction
4. Approximate locations relative to facility site(s)
5. A well construction diagram for each well must be included in the report, and should contain the following details:

    a. Total depth drilled
    b. Depth of open hole (same as total depth drilled if no caving occurs)
    c. Footage of hole collapsed
    d. Length of slotted casing installed
    e. Depth of bottom of casing
    f. Depth to top of sand pack
    g. Thickness of sand pack
    h. Depth to top of bentonite seal
    i. Thickness of bentonite seal
    j. Thickness of concrete grout
    k. Boring diameter
    l. Casing diameter
    m. Casing material

n. Size of perforations
o. Number of bags of sand
p. Well elevation at top of casing
q. Depth to ground water
r. Date of water level measurement
s. Monitoring well number
t. Date drilled
u. Location

B. **Well Development**:

1. Date(s) of development of each well
2. Method of development
3. Volume of water purged from well
4. How well development completion was determined
5. Method of effluent disposal
6. Field notes from well development should be included in report.

C. **Well Surveying**:

1. Provide reference elevations for each well and surveyor's notes

D. **Water Sampling**:

1. Date(s) of sampling
2. How well was purged
3. How many well volumes purged
4. Levels of temperature, electrical conductivity @ 25 °C, and pH at stabilization
5. Sample collection, handling, and preservation methods
6. Sample identification
7. Analytical methods used
8. Laboratory analytical data sheets
9. Water level elevation(s)
10. Groundwater contour map

E. **Soil Sampling** (if applicable):

1. Date(s) of sampling
2. Sample collection, handling, and preservation method
3. Sample identification
4. Analytical methods used
5. Laboratory analytical data sheets