



December 28, 2015

Mr. Jim Marshall, P.E.  
Senior Engineer  
Water Quality Control Engineer  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Central Valley Division  
11020 Sun Center Drive, #200  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95870-6114

*Emailed only: [RB5S-NPDES-Comments@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:RB5S-NPDES-Comments@waterboards.ca.gov)*

**SUBJECT: NORTH VALLEY REGIONAL RECYCLED WATER PROGRAM –  
TENTATIVE ORDER NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0085316**

Dear Mr. Marshall:

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Cities of Turlock and Modesto (Cities or Dischargers) regarding the Tentative Order Waste Discharge Requirements (TO) for the North Valley Regional Recycled Water Program (NVERRWP) that was issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) on November 25, 2015.

**NVERRWP OVERVIEW**

The NVERRWP began in 2010 as a collaborative partnership that includes the Cities of Modesto, Turlock, Ceres, Del Puerto Water District (DPWD or District), and Stanislaus County. The Partner Agencies for the NVERRWP – those agencies that have signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to share costs for the program’s implementation – include the Cities of Modesto and Turlock and DPWD. The proposed NVERRWP is a regional solution to address Delta water supply shortages and reliability concerns by utilizing recycled water for beneficial uses.

Specifically, the project proposes to introduce and convey, on a space available basis, up to 59,000 AFY (52.7 MGD) of blended, recycled water produced by the Cities of Modesto and Turlock directly into the Delta-Mendota Canal (DMC), which is owned by the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (USBR or Reclamation). The recycled water will be blended with Central Valley Project (CVP) water conveyed by the DMC.

*The project is consistent with the State Water Resources Control Board’s goals to increase recycled water production for beneficial uses, provide water to wetlands and wildlife areas, support drought resiliency, and provides a number of “co-benefits”.*

**NPDES PERMIT ISSUANCE**

The Cities very much appreciate Regional Water Board staff efforts to develop the NPDES permit for this project that will benefit downstream users with a more reliable source of high quality water. The Cities and NVRWWP partners have worked for several years to develop, evaluate, and plan this project, including preparation and certification of environmental documents and the previous submittal of Water Code Section 1211 petitions for a change in the point of discharge or use. The Cities support issuance of the NPDES permit, do not have significant comments on the TO, and have compiled corrections and clarifications for your consideration in Attachment A to this letter. The Cities and NVRWWP partners will continue to cooperatively work with stakeholders throughout the NPDES permit adoption, implementation of the project, and operation of the project.

Again, thank you for your consideration of our comments. We appreciate you and your staff's time and efforts to prepare the NPDES permit and support this important multi-benefit project. Please let us know if you have any questions regarding our comments or need additional materials.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Brian M. Laurenson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

Brian M. Laurenson  
Vice President

cc:

Michael Cooke, City of Turlock

Larry Parlin, City of Modesto

Dan Madden, City of Turlock

William Wong, City of Modesto

Lyndel Melton, RMC Water and Environment

Nicole Granquist, Downey Brand

Nichole Morgan, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

## **Attachment A. Detailed Comments on the NVRWP Tentative Order NPDES Permit**

---

1. Page 8, Section V.A. Please correct missing space after (Discharge Point No. 002)
2. Page 9, Section V.A.15. The Cities request that the receiving water locations be updated as follows to distinguish the Delta-Mendota Canal locations from existing San Joaquin River locations:

*Temperature.* The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F. Compliance to be determined based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSWDMC-001 and RSWDMC-002.

3. Page 17, Section VI.C.3.b. Because the discharge from the City of Turlock is not likely to occur immediately after permit adoption, the City of Turlock requests an alternate due date prior to initiation of discharge to the Delta-Mendota Canal as follows:

*Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate Pollutant Evaluation and Minimization Plan.* The City of Turlock shall develop a pollutant evaluation and minimization plan (PEMP) for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate and submit the PEMP to the Central Valley Water Board by **1 November 2016** or sixty days before initiation of discharge by the City of Turlock to the Delta-Mendota Canal.

4. Page B-1. Please correct the footer justification, page numbering (i.e., page “B-1” repeats), and Modesto WQCF label. Also, “Discharge point 001C” on Figure B-1 does not correspond to permit naming convention “Discharge No. 002”. Figure B-1 shows the City of Modesto’s primary facility while the secondary/tertiary facility is shown on Figures B-2 and B-3. The maps should be modified for clarity. The Cities will provide updated maps, where necessary, under separate cover.
  5. Page E-3, Table E-1. The “RSW-001” and “RSW-002” site location names are currently used by the Cities for their San Joaquin River discharge requirements. Therefore, it is confusing to apply the same names to different locations in the current laboratory information management systems and historical databases. *The Cities request that these site names be revised to “DMC-001” and “DMC-002,” respectively, or other alternative names that do not conflict with existing names.*
  6. Page E-4. Table E-1. Last row of table, insert space between “2” and “treatment”.
  7. Page E-4. Table E-1. Last two rows of table. The City of Modesto requests that the UV treatment effluent be referred to as “UVS-001A” for the Phase 1 system and “UVS-002A” for the Phase 2 system. The City of Modesto uses these values in their data tracking systems. “UVS-001” and “UVS-002” currently refer to their respective UV system influents.
  8. Page E-5, Table E-4. Correct table cell size for last two rows.
  9. Page E-6, Section IV.B.1. Table E- 4. Footnote 11 should be revised as follows: “*with a maximum reporting limit of 0.05 ng/L for methyl mercury and 0.5 ng/L for total mercury.*”
  10. Page E-7, Section IV.C.1. Table E-5. Footnote 8 should be revised as follows: “*with a maximum reporting limit of 0.05 ng/L for methyl mercury and 0.5 ng/L for total mercury.*”
-

11. Page E-9, Section V.B.2.c. Table E-6 allows the use of laboratory water or receiving water as the control, however, the text in this section only refers to receiving water. The Cities request the section be amended for clarity as follows:

*The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from Monitoring Location RSWDMC-001. Laboratory water may also be used as the control water as determined by the Discharger.*

12. Page E-12, Table E-8. *The City of Modesto requests that the site names be updated to UVS-001A and UVS-002A, to avoid confusion with existing naming conventions.*
13. Page E-13, Section IX.B.1. *The Cities request the following change to account for possible, but not expected intermittent discharge.*

*Monthly monitoring shall be conducted during 2019 (12 consecutive samples, evenly distributed throughout the year), in months that discharge is occurring, and the results of such monitoring shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the monthly self-monitoring reports.*

14. Page E-13, Section IX.B.2. The Cities request the following change to clarify “concurrent” sample collection as such:

***Concurrent Sampling.*** *Effluent and receiving water sampling shall be performed at approximately the same time of day, on the same date (i.e., both sites collected in the morning or afternoon or within a reasonable period on the same day). Reasonable variances from this timing are permitted if safety concerns prohibit sample collection and are adequately documented.*

15. Page E-17. Section X.B.2. The reporting requirements do not clearly identify the differences in reporting requirements for the individual cities. It is expected that the individual cities will be required to report only their own effluent, facility monitoring, and related reports. Receiving water monitoring will likely be performed jointly, but should also be reported individually. Further, additional clarification is requested on the frequency of reporting and the ability to combine reporting frequencies. *The Cities request the addition of the following language in this section:*

*The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The City of Turlock and the City of Modesto are only required to report for monitoring related to their facilities. While receiving monitoring may be a shared activity, both cities shall report the results of the shared monitoring. The Discharger shall submit monthly, quarterly, semiannual, and annual SMR's including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. These reports may be combined to include results from a more frequent sample collection (e.g., a quarterly report can be used to report monthly results), if the reports clearly identify the reporting frequency type.*

16. Page E-21, Section X.D.1. Table E-11 and Table E-12 require annual reporting on the progress of salinity control programs. Both cities already report on salinity control programs as part of their San Joaquin River NPDES permits that would continue until the initiation of Delta-Mendota Canal discharge. *The Cities request that the schedule in these tables be modified to “1 June, annually, following initiation of DMC discharge”.*
-

17. Page E-21, Section X.D.3. The section specifies that the Discharger must submit a report outlining the reporting methods and specifications for sample analysis within sixty days of permit adoption. *Because discharge will not be initiated immediately, the Cities request the following change be considered:*

*Within 60 days of permit adoption or 60 days before the initiation of discharge, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining reporting levels (RL's), method detection limits (MDL's), and analytical methods for the constituents listed in tables E-2, E-3, E-4, E-6, E-7, and E-8.*

18. Page F-24, Section IV.C.2.v.j. The last sentence on the page is missing letters, please revise to read "...bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate and chlorodibromomethane ...".
19. Page F-42, Section IV.C.3.b.iii.b. The City of Turlock requests additional clarification that the cause of bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate at the influent has not been determined with the following suggested revision:

*However, the laboratory data sheets for the detected results do not indicate that the detections are the result of laboratory contamination and there is a known industrial discharger (plastic recycler) that could reasonably discharges bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate to the collection system.*

20. Page F-62 through F-64, Section IV.C.4. Table F-11 and Table F-12 include effluent limitations for the City of Turlock and the City of Modesto, respectively. However, the tables do not indicate the compliance points for these effluent limitations (EFF-001A and EFF-001B, respectively). Additionally, neither table is specifically referenced in the text. *For clarity, the Cities request that the applicable point of compliance be noted in the related text or in a table footnotes.*

21. Page F-68, Section IV.D.4. The Cities have updated analysis of the percent NVRWP water at various locations in the system based on monthly increments and can provide more detailed information on the conservative assumptions used to calculate these values. The analyses prepared by the Cities following submittal of the June 2015 Antidegradation Analysis is based on the annual reports from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) system flows. These additional analyses confirm the finding of minor water quality impacts downstream from the discharge.

22. Pages F-72 through F-76, Section IV.D.5. Table F-14 and Table F-15 include effluent limitations for the City of Turlock and the City of Modesto, respectively. However, the tables do not indicate the compliance points for these effluent limitations (EFF-001A and EFF-001B, respectively). Additionally, neither table is specifically referenced in the text. *The Cities request that the applicable point of compliance be noted in the related text or in a table footnotes.*

23. Page F-82, Section V.B.3.b. The required study is due prior to the expected discharge. The City of Turlock requests a due date relative to the start of discharge as follows:

*The PEMP shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board by 1 November 2016 or sixty days before the initiation of discharge to the Delta-Mendota Canal.*

---