ORDER R5-2014-0015-01
NPDES NO. CA0078956

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
CITY OF PLACERVILLE
HANGTOWN CREEK WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY
EL DORADO COUNTY

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

Table 1. Discharger Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharger</th>
<th>City of Placerville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Facility</td>
<td>Hangtown Creek Water Reclamation Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
<td>2300 Coolwater Creek Road Placerville, CA 95667 El Dorado County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Discharge Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point</th>
<th>Effluent Description</th>
<th>Discharge Point Latitude (North)</th>
<th>Discharge Point Longitude (West)</th>
<th>Receiving Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Tertiary Treated Municipal Effluent</td>
<td>38° 43’ 40”</td>
<td>120° 51’ 04”</td>
<td>Hangtown Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Administrative Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7 February 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Order was adopted on:</td>
<td>27 April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Order shall become effective on:</td>
<td>1 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as an application for reissuance of WDR’s in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than:</td>
<td>180 days prior to the Order expiration date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region have classified this discharge as follows:</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I, PAMELA CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on 7 February 2014 and amended on 8 August 2014.

Original signed by Ken Landau for

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer
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I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the City of Placerville, Hangtown Creek Water Reclamation Facility (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility’s permit application.

II. FINDINGS

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

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

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

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

D. Monitoring and Reporting. 40 CFR 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.

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

The Discharger owns and operates the Facility subject to this Order. The monitoring reports required by this Order are necessary to determine compliance with this Order. The need for the monitoring reports is discussed in the Fact Sheet.
E. Notification of Interested Parties. The Central Valley Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR’s for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.

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

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R5-2008-0053 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Central Valley Water Board from taking enforcement action for past violations of the previous Order.

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

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


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

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

IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Monthly</td>
<td>Average Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Pollutants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-day @ 20°C)</td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Effluent Limitations
Parameter | Units | Effluent Limitations
---|---|---
| Average | Monthly | Average | Weekly | Maximum | Daily | Instantaneous | Minimum | Instantaneous | Maximum |
Total Suspended Solids | mg/L | 10 | 15 | 20 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| lbs/day$^1$ | 192 | 288 | 384 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

**Priority Pollutants**

- **Lead, Total Recoverable**
  - µg/L
  - 0.79
  - 1.3
  - --
  - --

- **Zinc, Total Recoverable**
  - µg/L
  - 37
  - 55
  - --
  - --

**Non-Conventional Pollutants**

- **Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)**
  - mg/L
  - 1.6
  - --
  - 4.7
  - --
  - --
  - lbs/day$^1$
  - 31
  - --
  - 90
  - --
  - --

- **Nitrate Plus Nitrite (as N)**
  - mg/L
  - 10
  - --
  - --
  - --

$^1$ Based on an average dry weather flow of 2.3 million gallons per day (MGD).

b. **Percent Removal**: The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD$_5$) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.

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

i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and

ii. 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.

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

i. 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median;

ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and

iii. 240 MPN/10 mL, at any time.

e. **Average Dry Weather Flow**: The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 2.3 MGD.

f. **Mercury, total**: The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.014 pounds/month.

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

i. 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and

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

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

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

C. **Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable**

V. **RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

A. **Surface Water Limitations**

The discharge shall not cause the following in Hangtown Creek.

1. **Bacteria**: The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor
more than 10 percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.

9. **Pesticides:**
   a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
   b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
   c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by 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 concentrations that exceed the maximum contaminant levels set forth in CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 15; nor
   g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.

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 (MCLs) specified in Table 64442 of section 64442 and Table 64443 of section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
11. **Suspended Sediments.** The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

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

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

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

15. **Temperature.** The annual average ambient temperature to be increased by more than 5°F and the discharge to cause exceedance of the following limitations in Hangtown Creek at Monitoring Location RSW-002:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
<th>Weekly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 December through 30 April</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>58°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May through 31 May</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>67°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 June through 15 October</td>
<td>77°F</td>
<td>72°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 October through 30 November</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>67°F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

17. **Turbidity:**
   a. Shall not exceed 2 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU (When wastewater is treated to a tertiary level, including coagulation, a 1-month averaging period may be used when determining compliance);
   b. Shall not increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs (When wastewater is treated to a tertiary level, including coagulation, a 1-month averaging period may be used when determining compliance);
   c. Shall not increase more than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs;
   d. Shall not increase more than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs; nor
   e. Shall not increase more than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

**B. Groundwater Limitations**

1. Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility shall not cause the underlying groundwater to contain waste constituents greater than background quality or Water Quality Objectives, whichever is greater.

**VI. PROVISIONS**

**A. Standard Provisions**

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:

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

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

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

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

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

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

   The causes for modification include:

   • **New regulations.** New regulations have been promulgated under section 405(d) of the CWA, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ii. Controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

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

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

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

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

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

i. Safeguard to electric power failure:

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

   ii. Upon written request by the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.

   iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Central Valley Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Central Valley Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Central Valley Water Board and 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 Central Valley Water Board, become a condition of this Order.

j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under the Central Valley Water Board Standard Provision contained in section VI.A.2.i of this Order.
The technical report shall:

i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.

ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.

iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Central Valley Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

k. A publicly owned treatment works whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years’ average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Central Valley Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.

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

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

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

o. In the event 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 Central Valley Water Board by telephone (916) 464-3291 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within 5 business days, unless the Central Valley Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by the Standard Provision contained in Attachment D section V.E.1. [40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(i)].

p. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements

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

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR 122.62, including, but not limited to:

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

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

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

c. Whole Effluent Toxicity. As a result of 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 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.

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

e. **Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection Operating Specifications.** The UV operating specifications in this Order are based on the UV guidelines developed by the National Water Research Institute and American Water Works Association Research Foundation titled, “Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse.” If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV Engineering study that identifies site-specific UV operating specifications that will achieve the virus inactivation equivalent to Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water, this Order may be reopened to modify the UV operating specifications.

f. **Dilution Credits/Mixing Zones.** The Discharger has conducted an initial dilution/mixing zone study that indicates receiving water flow may be available to allow dilution credits and mixing zones. Should the Discharger finalize its dilution/mixing zone study consistent with the requirements of Section 1.4.2 of the SIP, this Order may be reopened to adjust effluent limitations based on allowable dilution credits/mixing zones.

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 (WET) testing, as specified in MRP section V. Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent recurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TRES are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This provision includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.

i. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. The Discharger shall initiate a TRE to address effluent toxicity if any WET testing results exceed the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring.

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

iii. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the exceedance. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four chronic toxicity tests conducted once every two weeks using the species that exhibited toxicity.
The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:

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

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

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

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

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

(3) A schedule for these actions.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention
   a. Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan. The Discharger shall continue to implement their 23 January 2009 Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan to address sources of salinity from the municipal wastewater treatment system. The Discharger shall provide annual reports demonstrating reasonable progress in the reduction of salinity in its discharge to Hangtown Creek in accordance with section X.D.1 of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E).

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications
   a. Filtration System Operating Specifications. When discharging to surface water, to ensure the filtration system is operating properly to provide adequate disinfection of the wastewater, the turbidity of the filter effluent measured at Monitoring Locations FIL-001, FIL-002, and FIL-003 shall not exceed:
      i. 2 NTU as a daily average;
      ii. 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period; and
      iii. 10 NTU, at any time.

   b. Ultraviolet (UV) Disinfection System Operating Specifications. When discharging to surface water, the UV disinfection system must be operated in accordance with an operations and maintenance program that assures adequate disinfection, and shall meet the following minimum specifications to provide virus inactivation equivalent to Title 22 Disinfected Tertiary Recycled Water:
i. **UV Dose.** The minimum hourly average UV dose in the UV reactor shall be 100 millijoules per square centimeter (mjoules/cm²).

ii. **UV Transmittance.** The minimum hourly average UV transmittance (at 254 nanometers) in the wastewater measured at EFF-001 shall not fall below 55 percent.

iii. The lamp sleeves and cleaning system components must be visually inspected per the manufacturer’s operations manual for physical wear (scoring, solarization, seal leaks, cleaning fluid levels, etc.) and to check the efficacy of the cleaning system.

iv. The lamp sleeves must be cleaned periodically as necessary to meet the UV dose requirements.

v. Lamps must be replaced per the manufacturer’s operations manual, or sooner, if there are indications the lamps are failing to provide adequate disinfection. Lamp age and lamp replacement records must be maintained.

5. **Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)**

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

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

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

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

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

iii. The Discharger shall comply with Section IX.A. Biosolids of the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E.

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

v. **Within 180 days of the permit effective date,** the Discharger shall submit a biosolids use or disposal plan to the Central Valley Water Board. The plan shall describe at a minimum:

   (a) Sources and amounts of biosolids generated annually.

   (b) Location(s) of on-site storage and description of the containment area.

   (c) Plans for ultimate disposal. For landfill disposal, include the present classification of the landfill and the name and location of the landfill.

vi. 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.

vii. Use of biosolids as a soil amendment shall comply with valid WDRs issued by the State or Regional Water Boards. In most cases, this means the WDRs contained in State Water Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0012-DWQ, *General Waste Discharge Requirements for the Discharge of Biosolids to Land for Use as a Soil Amendment in Agricultural, Silvicultural, Horticultural, and Land Reclamation Activities* (Biosolids General Order). For a biosolids use project to be covered by the Biosolids General Order, the Discharger must file a complete Notice of Intent and receive a Notice of Applicability for each project.

b. **Biosolids Storage and Transportation Specifications**

   Biosolids shall be considered to be “stored” if they are placed on the ground or in non-mobile containers (i.e. not in a truck or trailer) at an intermediate storage location away from the generator/processing for more than 48 hours. Biosolids shall be considered to be “staged” if placed on the ground for brief periods of time solely to facilitate transfer of the biosolids between transportation and application vehicles.

   i. Biosolids shall not be stored directly on the ground at any one location for more than seven (7) consecutive days.

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

   iii. 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.

   iv. 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.

   v. Biosolids placed on site for more than 24 hours shall be covered.
vi. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed, maintained and operated to minimize the generation of leachate and the effects of erosion.

vii. If biosolids are to be stored at the site, a plan describing the storage program and means of complying with the specifications contained in sections VI.C.5.b and c of this Order shall be submitted for the Central Valley Water Board’s staff approval. The storage plan shall also include an adverse weather plan.

viii. The Discharger shall operate the biosolids storage facilities in accordance with the approved biosolids storage plan.

ix. The Discharger shall immediately remove and relocate any biosolids stored on site in violation of this Order.

c. Collection System. On 2 May 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ and any future revisions thereto. Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the general WDRs. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under Order 2006-0003-DWQ for operation of its wastewater collection system.

d. Continuous Monitoring Systems. This Order, and the Monitoring and Reporting Program which is a part of this Order, 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 shall 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 6 months of adoption of this permit. For systems installed following permit adoption, the notification system shall be installed simultaneously.

6. Other Special Provisions

a. Wastewater shall be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to the Department of Public Health (DPH; formerly the Department of Health Services) reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3, (Title 22), or equivalent.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

A. BOD$_5$ and TSS Effluent Limitations (Sections IV.A.1.a and IV.A.1.b). Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD$_5$ and TSS required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a. shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.b. for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD$_5$ and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

B. Total Mercury Mass Loading Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.f). The procedures for calculating mass loadings are as follows:
1. The total pollutant mass load for each individual calendar month shall be determined using an average of all concentration data collected that month and the corresponding total monthly flow. All effluent 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 Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.e). The average dry weather discharge flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the average dry weather flow effluent limitations will be determined annually based on the average daily flow over three consecutive dry weather months (e.g., July, August, and September).

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

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

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

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

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

1. Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the Reporting Level (RL).

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

3. When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and more than one sample result is available in a month, the discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of
DNQ or ND. In those cases, the discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:

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

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.

4. If a sample result, or the arithmetic mean or median of multiple sample results, is below the RL, and there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and the discharger conducts a PMP (as described in section 2.4.5.1), the discharger shall not be deemed out of compliance.

G. Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.g). Continuous monitoring analyzers for chlorine residual or for dechlorination agent residual in the effluent are appropriate methods for compliance determination. A positive residual dechlorination agent in the effluent indicates that chlorine is not present in the discharge, which demonstrates compliance with the effluent limitations. This type of monitoring can also be used to prove that some chlorine residual exceedances are false positives. Continuous monitoring data showing either a positive dechlorination agent residual or a chlorine residual at or below the prescribed limit are sufficient to show compliance with the total residual chlorine effluent limitations, as long as the instruments are maintained and calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations.

Any excursion above the 1-hour average or 4-day average total residual chlorine effluent limitations is a violation. If the Discharger conducts continuous monitoring and the Discharger can demonstrate, through data collected from a back-up monitoring system, that a chlorine spike recorded by the continuous monitor was not actually due to chlorine, then any excursion resulting from the recorded spike will not be considered an exceedance, but rather reported as a false positive. Records supporting validation of false positives shall be maintained in accordance with Section IV Standard Provisions (Attachment D).
ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

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

\[ \text{Arithmetic mean} = \mu = \frac{\Sigma x}{n} \]

where: \( \Sigma x \) is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and \( n \) is the number of samples.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)
DNQ are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory’s MDL. Sample results reported as DNQ are estimated concentrations.

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

**Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)**

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

**Enclosed Bays**

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

**Estimated Chemical Concentration**

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

**Estuaries**

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

**Inland Surface Waters**

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

**Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation**

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

**Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation**

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

**Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)**

The highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.
Median
The middle measurement in a set of data. The median of a set of data is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of measurements \( n \) is odd, then the median = \( X_{(n+1)/2} \). If \( n \) is even, then the median = \( (X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1})/2 \) (i.e., the midpoint between the \( n/2 \) and \( n/2+1 \)).

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

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

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

Not Detected (ND)
Sample results which are less than the laboratory’s MDL.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\[\sigma = \left(\frac{\sum(x - \mu)^2}{(n - 1)}\right)^{0.5}\]

where:
- \(x\) is the observed value;
- \(\mu\) is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and
- \(n\) is the number of samples.

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

[Map showing Hangtown Creek Water Reclamation Facility and Discharge Point 001]
ATTACHMENT C – WASTEWATER FLOW SCHEMATIC
ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply

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

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

B. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense

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

C. Duty to Mitigate

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

D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

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

E. Property Rights

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

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

F. Inspection and Entry

The Discharger shall allow the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (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).)

3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Central Valley Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):  
   a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));
   b. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
   c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Central Valley Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)

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

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

H. Upset

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

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).)

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

   a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));
   b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));
   c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
   d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv).)

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

II. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION

A. General

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

B. Duty to Reapply

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

C. Transfers

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

III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

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

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

IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

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

   B. Records of monitoring information shall include:

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

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

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

V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

   A. Duty to Provide Information

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

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k).)

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

3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
   a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
   b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
   c. The written authorization is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)

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

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

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

C. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4).)
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)

3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Central Valley Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii).)

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

D. Compliance Schedules

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

E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

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

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

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

F. Planned Changes

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

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

2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii)).
3. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in Order R5-2008-0053, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

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

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

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

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

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS
   A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)
      All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Central Valley Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)): 
      1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and 
      2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2).)
      3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3)).
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ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)

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

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

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

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

C. Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted by a laboratory certified for such analyses by the Department of Public Health (DPH). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine, such analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine must be kept onsite in the treatment facility laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Central Valley Water Board staff.

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

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

F. Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by DPH, in accordance with the provision of Water Code section 13176, and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports.

G. The Discharger shall conduct analysis on any sample provided by USEPA as part of the Discharge Monitoring Quality Assurance (DMQA) program. The results of any such analysis shall be submitted to USEPA's DMQA manager.
H. The Discharger shall file with the Central Valley Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.

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

II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point Name</th>
<th>Monitoring Location Name</th>
<th>Monitoring Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>Composite sampler after grit chamber and before the Parshall flume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>EFF-001</td>
<td>A location where a representative sample of wastewater can be collected immediately downstream of the ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection system and the last connection through which water can be admitted into the outfall. Latitude: 38° 43' 40&quot; N  Longitude: 120° 51' 04&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>RSW-001</td>
<td>100 feet upstream of the point of discharge and not influenced by the discharge of effluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>RSW-002</td>
<td>1,000 feet downstream of the point of discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>BIO-001</td>
<td>Sludge cake from Sludge Belt Presses #1 and #2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>FIL-001</td>
<td>Monitoring of the filter effluent to be measured immediately downstream of Gravity Filter MTU1 and prior to the UV disinfection system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>FIL-002</td>
<td>Monitoring of the filter effluent to be measured immediately downstream of Gravity Filter MTU2 and prior to the UV disinfection system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>FIL-003</td>
<td>Monitoring of the filter effluent to be measured immediately downstream of the pressure filters and prior to the UV disinfection system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

1. The Discharger shall monitor influent to the Facility at Monitoring Location INF-001 as follows:
### Table E-2. Influent Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Required Analytical Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite¹</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite¹</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ 24-hour flow proportional composite.
² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

### IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

#### A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

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

### Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Required Analytical Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite¹</td>
<td>3/Week</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5/Week¹²⁴</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite¹</td>
<td>3/Week</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Year</td>
<td>²,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Quarter</td>
<td>²,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Quarter</td>
<td>²,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>²,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>See Attachment I</td>
<td>See Attachment I</td>
<td>²,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week¹²¹</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine, Total Residual</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness, Total (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month¹¹</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury (methyl)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Quarter</td>
<td>²,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week¹¹²</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week¹¹²</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Day¹²⁴</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliform Organisms</td>
<td>MPN/100 mL</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>3/Week¹³</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Sample Type</td>
<td>Minimum Sampling Frequency</td>
<td>Required Analytical Test Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 24-hour flow proportional composite.
2. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
3. pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.
4. A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.
5. In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present in the effluent discharge, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.
6. For priority pollutant constituents the RL shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (See Attachment I, Table I-1).
7. Unfiltered methyl mercury and total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2), and shall be analyzed by U.S. EPA method 1630/1631 (Revision E) with a reporting level of 0.05 ng/L for methyl mercury and 0.5 ng/L for total mercury.
8. Concurrent with whole effluent toxicity monitoring.
9. Total chlorine residual monitoring is only required when chlorine is used in the treatment process.
10. Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L.
11. Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.
12. Monitoring for nitrite and nitrate shall be conducted concurrently.
13. Samples for total coliform organisms may be collected at any point following disinfection.

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 quarterly acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling.
2. Sample Types – The Discharger may use flow-through or static renewal testing. For static renewal testing, the samples shall be grab samples and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001.
3. Test Species – Test species shall be rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss).
4. Methods – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.
5. Test Failure – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 7 days following notification of test failure.
B. **Chronic Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct three species chronic toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. **Monitoring Frequency** – The Discharger shall perform quarterly, three species chronic toxicity testing.

2. **Sample Types** – Effluent samples shall be grab samples and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from Monitoring Location RSW-001, as identified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.

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

4. **Test Species** – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:
   - The cladoceran, water flea, Ceriodaphnia dubia (survival and reproduction test);
   - The fathead minnow, Pimephales promelas (larval survival and growth test); and
   - The green alga, Selenastrum capricornutum (growth test).


6. **Reference Toxicant** – As required by the SIP, all chronic toxicity tests shall be conducted with concurrent testing with a reference toxicant and shall be reported with the chronic toxicity test results.

7. **Dilutions** – For routine and accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, it is not necessary to perform the test using a dilution series. The chronic toxicity testing may be performed using 100% effluent and one control. For TRE monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-4, below, unless an alternative dilution series is detailed in the submitted TRE Action Plan. A receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Dilutions (%)</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Effluent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Control Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. TRE Reporting. Reports for TREs shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger’s approved TRE Workplan, or as amended by the Discharger’s TRE Action Plan.

4. Quality Assurance (QA). The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:
   a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.
   b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.
   c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE
VII. RECYCLING MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor Hangtown Creek at Monitoring Location RSW-001 as follows:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Required Analytical Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>See Attachment I</td>
<td>See Attachment I</td>
<td>¹,²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>¹,³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness, Total (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>¹,³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>°F (°C)</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5/Week, 2/Week</td>
<td>¹,³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   ¹ Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

   ² For priority pollutant constituents the RL shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (See Attachment I, Table I-1).

   ³ A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

   ⁴ Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

2. The Discharger shall monitor Hangtown Creek at Monitoring Location RSW-002 as follows:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Required Analytical Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>¹,²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>¹,²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Sample Type</td>
<td>Minimum Sampling Frequency</td>
<td>Required Analytical Test Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness, Total (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>°F (°C)</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5/Week, 2/Week</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
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 Facility.
3. Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

3. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002 when discharging at Discharge Point 001. 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; and
   g. Potential nuisance conditions (e.g. foam).

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

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS
A. Biosolids
   1. Monitoring Location BIO-001
      a. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected once per permit term 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 Part 122, Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols).
      b. Biosolids monitoring shall be conducted using the methods in Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods (EPA publication SW-846), as required in 40 CFR 503.8(b)(4). All results must be reported on a 100% dry weight basis. Records of all analyses must state on each page of the laboratory report whether the results are expressed in “100% dry weight” or “as is”.
      c. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of 5 years. A log shall be maintained of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log must be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.
B. Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection System

1. Monitoring Locations EFF-001, FIL-001, FIL-002, and FIL-003

The Discharger shall monitor the UV disinfection system at Monitoring Locations EFF-001, FIL-001, FIL-002, and FIL-003 as follows:

Table E-7. Ultraviolet Light Disinfection System Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Location</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>EFF-001 (^3)</td>
<td>Continuous (^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>FIL-001, FIL-002, and FIL-003</td>
<td>Continuous (^{1,2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of UV banks in operation</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Continuous (^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV Transmittance</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>EFF-001</td>
<td>Continuous (^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV Dose (^3)</td>
<td>mJoules/cm(^2)</td>
<td>Calculated</td>
<td>EFF-001</td>
<td>Continuous (^1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(^2\) Report daily average and maximum turbidity.

\(^3\) Report daily minimum hourly UV dose and daily average UV dose. The minimum hourly average dose shall consist of lowest hourly average dose provided in any channel that had at least one bank of lamps operating during the hour interval. For channels that did not operate for the entire hour interval, the dose will be averaged based on the actual operation time.

\(^4\) Flow monitoring at EFF-001 may be used to satisfy the UV disinfection system flow monitoring requirement, provided flow was not diverted between the UV disinfection system and EFF-001.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.

2. Upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a summary monitoring report. The report shall contain both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year(s).

3. Compliance Time Schedules. For compliance time schedules included in the Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley 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 Central Valley Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.

4. The Discharger shall report to the Central Valley Water Board any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission within 15 days of reporting the data to the Commission pursuant to section 313 of the "Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act" of 1986.
B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMR’s)

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit SMR’s using the State Water Board’s California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html). The CIWQS Web site will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.

2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit monthly SMR’s including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMR’s are to include all new monitoring results obtained since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.

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

   Table E-8. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

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

4. Reporting Protocols. The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable RL and the current laboratory’s Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136.
The Discharger shall report the results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample using the following reporting protocols:

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

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

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

c. Sample results less than the laboratory’s MDL shall be reported as “Not Detected,” or ND.

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

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

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

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

6. The Discharger shall submit SMR’s in accordance with the following requirements:

a. The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.

b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the WDR’s; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions.
Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.

7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMR’s calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:
   a. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the average dry weather flow for the effluent. The average dry weather flow shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.C and reported in the December SMR.

   b. **Mass Loading Limitations.** For BOD$_5$, TSS, and ammonia, the Discharger shall calculate and report the mass loading (lbs/day) in the SMRs. The mass loading shall be calculated as follows:

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

   When calculating daily mass loading, the daily average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For weekly average mass loading, the weekly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For monthly average mass loading, the monthly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used.

   c. **Removal Efficiency (BOD$_5$ and TSS).** The Discharger shall calculate and report the percent removal of BOD$_5$ and TSS in the SMRs. The percent removal shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.A. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

   d. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the 7-day median of total coliform organisms for the effluent. The 7-day median of total coliform organisms shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.D. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

   e. **Monthly Mercury Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the monthly mercury mass loading for the effluent. The monthly mass loading shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.B. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

   f. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall measure, or calculate where appropriate, and report monthly in the self-monitoring report: i) the dissolved oxygen concentration, ii) the percent of saturation in the main water mass, and iii) the 95th percentile dissolved oxygen concentration.

   g. **Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the turbidity increase in the receiving water applicable to the natural turbidity condition specified in Section V.A.17.a-e. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

   h. **Temperature Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate the annual average temperature increase in the receiving water based on the difference in the annual average temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. The annual average shall be calculated as the average of the samples gathered for the calendar year. The Discharger shall report the annual average temperature increase in the January SMR.

   The Discharger shall also calculate the weekly average downstream receiving water temperature at Monitoring Location RSW-002 and report it in the monthly SMRs.
C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR’s)

1. At any time during the term of this permit, the State Water Board or Central Valley Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit DMR’s. Until such notification is given specifically for the submittal of DMR’s, the Discharger shall submit DMR’s in accordance with the requirements described below.

2. DMR’s 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:

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

3. All discharge monitoring results must be reported on the official U.S. EPA pre-printed DMR forms (EPA Form 3320-1) or on self-generated forms that follow the exact same format of EPA Form 3320-1.

D. Other Reports

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Provision</th>
<th>Reporting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan, Annual Reports</td>
<td>1 February, annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Special Provision VI.C.3.a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Discharger shall report the results of any special studies, acute and chronic toxicity testing, TRE/TIE, PMP, and Pollution Prevention Plan required by Special Provisions VI.C. The Discharger shall submit reports with the first monthly SMR scheduled to be submitted on or immediately following the report due date.

3. Within 60 days of permit adoption, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining RLs, method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval. The Discharger shall comply with the monitoring and reporting requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the SIP. The maximum required RLs for priority pollutant constituents shall be based on the Minimum Levels (MLs) contained in Appendix 4 of the SIP, determined in accordance with Section 2.4.2 and Section 2.4.3 of the SIP. In accordance with Section 2.4.2 of the SIP, when there is more than one ML value for a given substance, the Central Valley Water Board shall include as RLs, in the permit, all ML values, and their associated analytical methods, listed in Appendix 4 that are below the calculated effluent limitation. The Discharger may select any one of those cited analytical methods for compliance determination. If no ML value is below the effluent limitation, then the Central Valley Water Board shall select as the RL, the lowest ML value, and its associated analytical method, listed in Appendix 4 for inclusion in the
permit. Table I-1 (Attachment I) provides required maximum RLs in accordance with the SIP.

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 Central Valley Water Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing. The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the waste discharge requirements.
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ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

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

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

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table F-1. Facility Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Facility Address | 2300 Coolwater Creek Road  
Placerville, CA 95667  
El Dorado County |
| Facility Contact, Title and Phone | Wylie Henderson, Plant Superintendent, (530) 626-5230 |
| Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports | Nathan Stong, City Engineer, (530) 642-5250 |
| Mailing Address | 3101 Center Street, Placerville, CA 95667 |
| Billing Address | Same as Mailing Address |
| Type of Facility | Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW) |
| Major or Minor Facility | Major |
| Threat to Water Quality | 2 |
| Complexity | B |
| Pretreatment Program | Not Applicable |
| Recycling Requirements | Not Applicable |
| Facility Permitted Flow | 2.3 million gallons per day (MGD), average dry weather flow |
| Facility Design Flow | 2.3 MGD, average dry weather flow  
5.7 MGD, peak wet weather flow |
| Watershed | South Fork American |
| Receiving Water | Hangtown Creek |
| Receiving Water Type | Inland Surface Water |

A. The City of Placerville (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of Hangtown Creek Water Reclamation Facility (hereinafter Facility), a POTW.

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

B. The Facility discharges wastewater to Hangtown Creek, a water of the United States, tributary to Weber Creek and the South Fork of the American River within the South Fork American
watershed. The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2008-0053 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0078956 adopted on 25 April 2008 and expired on 1 April 2013. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

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

C. The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its WDR’s and NPDES permit on 2 October 2012. The application was deemed complete on 17 June 2013. A site visit was conducted on 5 June 2013 to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the community of the City of Placerville and a portion of El Dorado County and serves a population of approximately 10,000. The design average dry weather flow capacity of the Facility is 2.3 MGD.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

The wastewater treatment plant provides primary, secondary and tertiary treatment, including effluent cooling. The treatment train includes a headworks, primary clarifiers, biological nutrient removal, secondary clarifiers, flow equalization, effluent cooling, upflow clarifiers followed by gravity filtration, ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection, and effluent aeration. The Facility possesses an emergency chlorine disinfection system and chlorine disinfectant and dechlorinating agent are maintained onsite for use in the event of a failure of the UV disinfection system. The solids processing facilities include anaerobic digesters for all sludge. Digested sludge is dewatered with a belt filter press and disposed off-site at a permitted land disposal facility or by application to agricultural land.

During the term of Order R5-2008-0053, the Facility underwent treatment system upgrades which included the installation of the following units: an effluent cooling system, a biological nutrient removal system (a Modified Ludzak-Ettinger process capable of nitrification and denitrification), secondary clarifiers, UV disinfection, and tertiary filters. The chlorine disinfection system was replaced with a UV disinfection system; however, the Facility retains the capacity to use chlorine disinfection in emergency situations. The Discharger submitted a letter on 2 March 2009 reporting that construction on the improvements had reached substantial completion. The start-up period for the upgraded treatment system concluded at the end of December 2009.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 11, T10N, R10E, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.

2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point 001 to Hangtown Creek, a water of the United States, and a tributary of the South Fork of the American River via Weber Creek at a point latitude 38° 43’ 40” N and longitude 120° 51’ 04” W.
C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data

Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2008-0053 for discharges from Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2008-0053 are as follows:

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitation</th>
<th>Monitoring Data (June 2008 – March 2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Monthly</td>
<td>Average Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Dry Weather Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>2.3&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand 5-day @ 20°C</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Removal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Removal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4,5-TP (Silvex)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-D</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrazine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia, Total (as N)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-Endosulfan</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorodibromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyanide, Total</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4′-DDD</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalapon</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinoseb</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorodibromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin Aldehyde</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptachlor</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>lbs/month</td>
<td>0.014&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trihalomethanes, Total</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>300&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parameter | Units | Effluent Limitation | Monitoring Data (June 2008 – March 2013)
--- | --- | --- | ---
| | | Average Monthly | Average Weekly | Maximum Daily | Highest Average Monthly Discharge | Highest Average Weekly Discharge | Highest Daily Discharge |
Manganese, Total Recoverable | µg/L | 50<sup>2</sup> | -- | -- | 45 | -- | -- |
Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N) | mg/L | 10 | -- | -- | 16 | -- | -- |
Sulfide | mg/L | -- | -- | 2.0<sup>4</sup> | -- | -- | <0.84 |
Turbidity | NTU | -- | 2<sup>5</sup> | 5<sup>6</sup>/10<sup>4</sup> | -- | -- | 2.8 |
Total Coliform Organisms | MPN/100 mL | -- | 2.2<sup>7</sup> | 23<sup>8</sup>/240<sup>4</sup> | -- | -- | 70 |
Total Residual Chlorine | mg/L | 0.01<sup>9</sup> | -- | 0.02<sup>10</sup> | 0.013 | -- | 0.12 |
Settleable Solids | mL/L | 0.1 | -- | 0.2 | <0.1 | -- | <0.1 |
Acute Toxicity | % Survival | -- | -- | 70<sup>11</sup>/90<sup>12</sup> | -- | -- | 90<sup>13</sup> |

**ND** = Non-Detect  
**NR** = Not Reported

1. Applied as a total monthly mass loading effluent limitation.  
2. Maximum observed effluent concentration in µg/L. Maximum total monthly mass loading not reported.  
3. Applied as an annual average effluent limitation.  
4. Instantaneous maximum.  
5. Applied as a daily average effluent limitation.  
6. Not to be exceeded more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period.  
7. Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.  
8. Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.  
9. Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.  
10. Applied as 1-hour average effluent limitation.  
11. Minimum for any one bioassay.  
12. Median for any three consecutive bioassays.  
13. Represents the minimum observed percent survival.  
14. Average Dry Weather Flow

### D. Compliance Summary

1. The Central Valley Water Board issued Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Complaint Order R5-2009-0586 on 8 December 2009 which proposed to assess a civil liability of $60,000 against the Discharger for violations of effluent limitations for total coliform organisms, turbidity, chlorine residual, nitrate, pH, and dichlorobromomethane during the terms of Orders 5-01-045 and R5-2008-0053. The Discharger settled the ACL by completion of a special compliance project.

2. The Central Valley Water Board issued ACL Complaint Order R5-2011-0521 on 28 February 2011 which proposed to assess a civil liability of $18,000 against the Discharger for violations of ammonia effluent limitations. The Discharger settled the ACL by completion of a special compliance project.

3. A Compliance and Enforcement Inspection (CEI) was conducted at the Facility on 4 April 2013. The inspection produced no adverse findings.

### E. Planned Changes – Not Applicable

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

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

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

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

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


1. Water Quality Control Plans. Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans.


   The Basin Plan at II-2.00 states that the beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. The Basin Plan in Table II-1, Section II, does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Hangtown Creek, but does identify present and potential uses for the South Fork of the American River from Placerville to Folsom Lake, to which Hangtown Creek, via Weber Creek, is tributary. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Thus, beneficial uses applicable to Hangtown Creek are as follows:

   Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point</th>
<th>Receiving Water Name</th>
<th>Beneficial Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Hangtown Creek</td>
<td>Existing uses from Table II-1 of the Basin Plan: Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN); Agricultural supply for irrigation (AGR); Hydropower generation (POW); Water contact recreation, including canoeing, and rafting (REC-1); Non-contact water recreation (REC-2); Warm freshwater habitat (WARM); Cold freshwater habitat (COLD); and Wildlife habitat (WILD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Existing: Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN); Agricultural supply for irrigation (AGR); Industrial service supply (IND); and Industrial process supply (PRO).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000, U.S. EPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on 13 February 2001. These rules contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants.

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

4. **Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulation 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California’s antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution 68-16. Resolution 68-16 is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Central Valley Water Board’s Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge must be consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.

5. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in Order R5-2008-0053, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.

6. **Human Right to Water Act.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.

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

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

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

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

9. **Storm Water Requirements.** USEPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The Discharger has submitted a Notice of Intent and been approved for coverage under the State Water Board’s Industrial Stormwater General Order. Therefore, this Order does not regulate storm water.

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

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 CWA, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. The waters on these lists do not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 11 October 2011 USEPA gave final approval to California’s 2008-2010 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs). The Basin Plan references this list of WQLSs, which are defined as “…those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 CFR Part 130, et seq.).” The Basin Plan also states, “Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.” Hangtown Creek is a tributary to the South Fork of the American River which is listed for mercury. This Order includes a mass-based effluent limitation for mercury designed to maintain the Facility’s current level of treatment performance until such time as a mercury TMDL is approved and implemented.

2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).** USEPA requires the Central Valley Water Board to develop TMDLs for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. Hangtown Creek is not an impaired waterbody and no active TMDLs are applicable to Hangtown Creek or to discharges from the Facility.
3. The 303(d) listings and TMDLs have been considered in the development of the Order. A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation of each pollutant of concern is described in section VI.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations

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

IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include 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.

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

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

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

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

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. **Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.

2. **Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of untreated wastewater, except under the conditions at CFR Part 122.41(m)(4)).** As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal regulations, 40 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.

3. **Prohibition III.C (No controllable condition shall create a nuisance).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13050 that requires water quality objectives established for the prevention of nuisance within a specific area. The Basin Plan prohibits conditions that create a nuisance.

4. **Prohibition III.D (No inclusion of pollutant free wastewater shall cause improper operation of the Facility’s systems).** This prohibition is based on 40 CFR Part 122.41 et seq. that requires the proper design and operation of treatment facilities.
B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

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

Regulations promulgated in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3(a)(1) require technology-based effluent limitations for municipal Dischargers to be placed in NPDES permits based on Secondary Treatment Standards or Equivalent to Secondary Treatment Standards. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) established the minimum performance requirements for 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 U.S. EPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, U.S. EPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 C.F.R. part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

a. **BOD₅ and TSS.** Federal regulations, 40 CFR Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD₅ and TSS. This Order establishes WQBELs that are equal to or more stringent than the secondary technology-based treatment described in 40 CFR Part 133 and are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. (See section IV.C.3.c of this Attachment for the discussion on WQBELs for pathogens.) 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. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS over each calendar month.

b. **Flow.** The Facility was designed to provide a tertiary level of treatment for up to a design average dry weather flow of 2.3 MGD. Therefore, this Order contains an average dry weather discharge flow effluent limit of 2.3 MGD.

c. **pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 CFR Part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units.

**Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations**

**Discharge Point 001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Average Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conventional Pollutants**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Average Monthly</th>
<th>Average Weekly</th>
<th>Maximum Daily</th>
<th>Instantaneous Minimum</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-day 20°C)</td>
<td>lbs/day³</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Average dry weather design flow.
2. Note that more stringent WQBELs for BOD₅, pH, and TSS are applicable and are established as final effluent limitations in this Order (see section IV.C.3.d of this Fact Sheet).
3. Based on an average dry weather flow of 2.3 MGD.

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

CWA Section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements or other provisions, is discussed in section IV.B.2 of the Fact Sheet.

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

The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in other state plans and policies, or any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply.
The Basin Plan on page II-1.00 states: “Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning…” and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that “…disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses.”

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

a. Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses. Refer to III.C.1. above for a complete description of the receiving water and beneficial uses.

Hangtown Creek is a small, perennial creek of the western Sierra Nevada range. Its headwaters originate at an elevation of approximately 2,400 feet above mean sea level, near the City of Placerville in El Dorado County. Hangtown Creek transitions from a cold headwater creek dominated by rainbow trout (elevation 2,400 feet) to a cool foothill creek dominated by California roach and Sacramento suckers at its confluence with Weber Creek 7.4 miles downstream and at an elevation of about 1,400 feet. The aquatic communities of Hangtown Creek are more diverse in the reach upstream of the City of Placerville and in the reach that is downstream of the Facility. In contrast, the reach that flows through the City of Placerville and past the treatment plant has less diversity. Species diversity is a relative indicator of environmental conditions—a greater diversity of species indicates better environmental conditions than is indicated by less diversity.

The South Fork of the American River is heavily used for whitewater kayaking and rafting during high flows. In May 2007, the 50-year-old federal utility license for Sacramento Municipal Utility District was renewed. The license gives the Sacramento Municipal Utility District control of how much water is released from dams on the South Fork of the American River. The renewed license requires that the Sacramento Municipal Utility District provide enough water to more closely mimic a natural flow, which will improve rafting and should provide some restoration of environmental conditions.

b. Effluent and Ambient Background Data. The RPA, as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on effluent data dating from January 2010 through March 2013 and on ambient background data dating from July 2008 through March 2013. Effluent and ambient background data are submitted in SMRs and the ROWD.
As discussed in section II.A of the Fact Sheet, the Facility underwent substantial upgrades during the term of Order R5-2008-0053. The system upgrades were completed in 2009 and the new treatment train was fully operational by January 2010. Effluent data collected prior to January 2010 is not representative of the Facility’s typical functional capabilities and was, therefore, not considered in the RPA.

c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.** Based on the available information, the worst-case dilution is assumed to be zero to provide protection for the receiving water beneficial uses. The impact of assuming zero assimilative capacity within the receiving water is that discharge limitations are end-of-pipe limits with no allowance for dilution within the receiving water.

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

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

This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness as required by the SIP\(^1\), the CTR\(^2\) and State Water Board Order No. WQO 2008-0008 (City of Davis). The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. (SIP, § 1.2; 40 CFR § 131.38(c)(4)) 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. Therefore, where reliable, representative data are available, the hardness value for calculating criteria can be the downstream receiving water hardness, after mixing with the effluent (Order WQO 2008-0008, p. 11). The Central Valley Water Board thus has considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness (*Id.*, p.10).

As discussed below, scientific literature provides a reliable method for calculating protective hardness-dependent CTR criteria, considering all discharge conditions. This methodology produces hardness-dependent CTR criteria based on the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness that ensure these metals do not cause receiving water toxicity under any downstream receiving water condition. Under this methodology, the Central Valley Water Board considers all hardness conditions that could occur in the ambient downstream receiving water after the

---

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

\(^2\) The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as 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.
effluent has mixed with the water body\(^1\). This ensures that effluent limitations are fully protective of aquatic life in all areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge under all flow conditions, at the fully mixed location, and throughout the water body including at the point of discharge into the water body.

i. **Conducting the reasonable potential Analysis (RPA).** The SIP in Section 1.3 states, “The RWQCB shall...determine whether a discharge may: (1) cause, (2) have a reasonable potential to cause, or (3) contribute to an excursion above any applicable priority pollutant criterion or objective.” Section 1.3 provides a step-by-step procedure for conducting the RPA. The procedure requires the comparison of the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) and maximum ambient background concentration to the applicable criterion that has been properly adjusted for hardness. Unless otherwise noted, for the hardness-dependent CTR metals criteria the following procedures were followed for properly adjusting the criterion for hardness when conducting the RPA.

(a) The SIP requires WQBELs if the MEC is equal to or exceeds the applicable criterion, adjusted for hardness. For comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, the “fully mixed” reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criterion. In this evaluation the portion of the receiving water affected by the discharge is analyzed. For hardness-dependent criteria, the hardness of the effluent has an impact on the determination of the applicable criterion in areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge. Therefore, for comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criterion. For this situation it is necessary to consider the hardness of the effluent in determining the applicable criterion to adjust the criterion. The procedures for determining the applicable criterion after proper adjustment using the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness is outlined in subsection ii, below.

(b) The SIP requires WQBELs if the receiving water is impaired upstream (outside the influence) of the discharge, i.e., if the maximum ambient background concentration of a pollutant exceeds the applicable criterion, adjusted for hardness\(^2\). For comparing the maximum ambient background concentration to the applicable criterion, the reasonable worst-case upstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criteria. This is appropriate, because this area is outside the influence of the discharge. Since the discharge does not impact the upstream hardness, the effect of the effluent hardness was not included in this evaluation.

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

---

\(^1\) All effluent discharges will change the ambient downstream metals concentration and hardness. It is not possible to change the metals concentration without also changing the hardness.

\(^2\) The pollutant must also be detected in the effluent.
A 2006 Study\(^1\) developed procedures for calculating the effluent concentration allowance (ECA)\(^2\) for CTR hardness-dependent metals. The 2006 Study demonstrated that it is necessary to evaluate all discharge conditions (e.g., high and low flow conditions) and the hardness and metals concentrations of the effluent and receiving water when determining the appropriate ECA for these hardness-dependent metals. This method is superior to relying on downstream receiving water samples alone because it captures all possible mixed conditions in the receiving water. Both receiving water and effluent hardness vary based on flow and other factors, but the variability of receiving water and effluent hardness is sometimes independent. Using a calculated hardness value ensures that the Central Valley Water Board considers all possible mixed downstream values that may result from these two independent variables. Relying on receiving water sampling alone is less likely to capture all possible mixed downstream conditions.

The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR\(^3\), is as follows:

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

Where:

- \(H\) = hardness (as CaCO\(_3\))\(^4\)
- \(WER\) = water-effect ratio
- \(m, b\) = metal- and criterion-specific constants

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

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

\[
ECA = C \quad \text{(when } C \leq B)\]
(Equation 2)

Where:

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

The 2006 Study demonstrated that the relationship between hardness and the calculated criteria is the same for some metals, so the same procedure for calculating the ECA may be used for these metals. The same procedure can be used for chronic cadmium, chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc. These metals are hereinafter referred to as “Concave Down Metals”.

---


\(^2\) The ECA is defined in Appendix 1 of the SIP (page Appendix 1-2). The ECA is used to calculate WQBELs in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP.

\(^3\) 40 CFR § 131.38(b)(2).

\(^4\) For this discussion, all hardness values are in mg/L as CaCO\(_3\).

\(^5\) The 2006 Study assumes the ambient background metals concentration is equal to the CTR criterion (i.e., \(C \leq B\))
refers to the shape of the curve represented by the relationship between hardness and the CTR criteria in Equation 1. Another similar procedure can be used for determining the ECA for acute cadmium, lead, and acute silver, which are referred to hereafter as “Concave Up Metals”.

**ECA for Chronic Cadmium, Chromium III, Copper, Nickel, and Zinc** – For Concave Down Metals (i.e., chronic cadmium, chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc) the 2006 Study demonstrates that when the effluent is in compliance with the CTR criteria and the upstream receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria, any mixture of the effluent and receiving water will always be in compliance with the CTR criteria. The 2006 Study proves that regardless of whether the effluent hardness is lower or greater than the upstream hardness, the reasonable worst-case flow condition is the effluent dominated condition (i.e., no receiving water flow). Consequently, for Concave Down Metals, the CTR criteria have been calculated using the downstream ambient hardness under this condition.

The effluent hardness ranged from 40 mg/L to 67 mg/L, based on 353 samples from January 2010 to March 2013. The upstream receiving water hardness varied from 46 mg/L to 146 mg/L, based on 85 samples from July 2008 to March 2013. Under the effluent dominated condition, the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness is 40 mg/L. As demonstrated in the example shown in Table F-5, below, using this hardness to calculate the ECA for all Concave Down Metals will result in WQBELs that are protective under all flow conditions, from the effluent dominated condition to high flow condition.

This example for zinc assumes the following conservative conditions for the upstream receiving water:

- Upstream receiving water **always** at the lowest observed upstream receiving water hardness (i.e., 46 mg/L)
- Upstream receiving water zinc concentration **always** at the CTR criteria (i.e., no assimilative capacity).

Using these reasonable worst-case receiving water conditions, a simple mass balance (as shown in Equation 3, below) accounts for all possible mixtures of effluent and receiving water under all flow conditions.

\[
C_{\text{MIX}} = C_{\text{RW}} \times (1-\text{EF}) + C_{\text{Eff}} \times \text{EF} \quad \text{(Equation 3)}
\]

Where:

- \(C_{\text{MIX}}\) = Mixed concentration (e.g., metals or hardness)
- \(C_{\text{RW}}\) = Upstream receiving water concentration
- \(C_{\text{Eff}}\) = Effluent concentration
- \(\text{EF}\) = Effluent Fraction

---

1. 2006 Study, p. 5700
2. There are two typographical errors in the 2006 Study in the discussion of Concave Down Metals when the effluent hardness is less than the receiving water hardness. The effluent and receiving water hardness were transposed in the discussion, but the correct hardness values were used in the calculations. The typographical errors were confirmed by the author of the 2006 Study, by email dated 1 April 2011, from Dr. Robert Emerick to Mr. James Marshall, Central Valley Water Board.
In this example, for zinc, for any receiving water flow condition (high flow to low flow), the fully-mixed downstream ambient zinc concentration is in compliance with the CTR criteria.\(^1\)

**Table F-5. Zinc ECA Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effluent Fraction(^6)</th>
<th>Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardness (mg/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Highest assumed upstream receiving water zinc concentration calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 46 mg/L.

\(^2\) ECA calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 40 mg/L.

\(^3\) Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.

\(^4\) Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.

\(^5\) Fully mixed downstream ambient zinc concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent zinc concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.

\(^6\) The effluent fraction ranges from 1% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

**ECA for Acute Cadmium, Lead, and Acute Silver** – For Concave Up Metals (i.e., acute cadmium, lead, and acute silver), the relationship between hardness and the metals criteria is different than for Concave Down Metals. The 2006 Study demonstrates that for Concave Up Metals, the effluent and upstream receiving water can be in compliance with the CTR criteria, but the resulting mixture may contain metals concentrations that exceed the CTR criteria and could cause toxicity. For these metals, the 2006 Study provides a mathematical approach to calculate the ECA that is protective of aquatic life, in all areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge, under all discharge and receiving water flow conditions (see Equation 4, below).

The ECA, as calculated using Equation 4, is based on the reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness, the lowest observed effluent hardness, and assuming no receiving water assimilative capacity for metals.

---

\(^1\) This method considers the actual lowest observed upstream hardness and actual lowest observed effluent hardness to determine the reasonable worst-case ambient downstream hardness under all possible receiving water flow conditions. Table F-5 demonstrates that the receiving water is always in compliance with the CTR criteria at the fully-mixed location in the receiving water. It also demonstrates that the receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria for all mixtures from the point of discharge to the fully-mixed location. Therefore, a mixing zone is not used for compliance.
(i.e., ambient background metals concentrations are at their respective CTR criterion). Equation 4 is not used in place of the CTR equation (Equation 1). Rather, Equation 4, which is derived using the CTR equation, is used as a direct approach for calculating the ECA. This replaces an iterative approach for calculating the ECA. The CTR equation has been used to evaluate the receiving water downstream of the discharge at all discharge and flow conditions to ensure the ECA is protective (e.g., see Table F-6).

\[
ECA = \left( \frac{m(H_e - H_{rw})}{H_{rw}} \right) e^{m \ln(H_{rw}) + b} + e^{m \ln(H_{rw}) + b}
\]

(Equation 4)

where:

\[
m, b = \text{criterion specific constants (from CTR)}
\]

\[
H_e = \text{lowest observed effluent hardness}
\]

\[
H_{rw} = \text{reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness}
\]

An example similar to the Concave Down Metals is shown for acute cadmium, a Concave Up Metal, in Table F-6, below. As previously mentioned, the lowest effluent hardness is 40 mg/L, while the upstream receiving water hardness ranged from 46 mg/L to 146 mg/L. In this case, the reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness to use in Equation 4 to calculate the ECA is 146 mg/L.

In this case for acute cadmium, the lowest possible fully-mixed downstream hardness is 40 mg/L (see last row of Table F-6), which corresponds to a total recoverable acute ECA of 1.6 µg/L, using Equations 1 and 2. However, a lower chronic ECA is required to ensure the discharge does not cause toxicity at any location in the receiving water, at or downstream of the discharge, which would be a violation the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective1. This is because for concave up metals, mixing two waters with different hardness with metals concentrations at their respective CTR criteria will always result in CTR criterion exceedances2. As shown in Table F-6, an acute ECA of 1.3 µg/L is necessary to be protective under all discharge conditions. In this example for acute cadmium, for any receiving water flow condition (high flow to low flow), the fully-mixed downstream ambient cadmium concentration is in compliance with the CTR criteria.

Using the procedures discussed above to calculate the ECA for all Concave Up Metals will result in WQBELs that are protective under all potential effluent/receiving water flow conditions (high flow to low flow) and under all known hardness conditions, as demonstrated in Table F-6, for acute cadmium.

---

1 “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, p. III-8.01.)

Table F-6. Cadmium ECA Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effluent Fraction</th>
<th>Lowest Observed Effluent Hardness (mg/L)</th>
<th>Reasonable Worst-case Upstream Receiving Water Hardness (mg/L)</th>
<th>Reasonable Worst-case Upstream Receiving Water Cadmium Concentration (µg/L)</th>
<th>Cadmium ECA_{acute} (µg/L)</th>
<th>Complies with CTR Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Flow</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Low Flow</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Low Flow</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Low Flow</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Low Flow</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% Low Flow</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Low Flow</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water cadmium concentration calculated using Equation 1 for acute criterion at a hardness of 146 mg/L.
2. ECA calculated using Equation 4 for acute criteria.
3. Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction.
4. Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the acute criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.
5. Fully mixed downstream ambient cadmium concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent cadmium concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction.
6. The effluent fraction ranges from 1% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

The receiving water at times contains concentrations of lead that exceed water quality criteria associated with the hardness condition previous to the discharge. The 2006 Study procedures remain applicable under these conditions. The discharge cannot cause or contribute to a violation of water quality criteria/objectives in the receiving water. Although metals concentrations downstream of the discharge exceed CTR criteria, the cause of the exceedance is not due to the discharge, it is due to the elevated metals concentrations upstream of the discharge. Implementing the procedures of the 2006 Study does not result in an increase in toxicity downstream of the discharge, and in fact reduces the amount of toxicity already present in the receiving water. This is demonstrated in the example below for lead (see Table F-7).

As shown in Table F-7 for lead, prior to the discharge the lead has been observed to exceed water quality criteria by up to 77%. When the receiving water contains some fraction of effluent, the percent exceedance is reduced. The greater the amount of effluent in the receiving water, the lower the percent exceedance, until a fully compliant state is achieved when the effluent constitutes the entire flow. The effluent limitation associated with lead, therefore, is sufficient to assure that the discharge never causes or contributes to a violation of a water quality criterion, and in fact reduces the amount of toxicity already present in the receiving water.
Table F-7. Lead ECA Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effluent Fraction</th>
<th>Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardness (mg/L)</td>
<td>CTR Criteria (µg/L)</td>
<td>Lead (µg/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Flow</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Highest observed upstream receiving water lead concentration which corresponds to a chronic criterion calculated using Equation 1 at a hardness of 72 mg/L.
2. ECA calculated using Equation 4 for chronic criterion.
3. Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.
4. Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.
5. Fully mixed downstream ambient lead concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent lead concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction.
6. The effluent fraction ranges from 0% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

Based on the procedures discussed above, Table F-8 lists all the CTR hardness-dependent metals and the associated ECA used in this Order.

Table F-8. Summary of ECA Evaluations for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR Metals</th>
<th>ECA (µg/L, Total Recoverable)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute</td>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium III</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs
   a. Constituents with No Reasonable Potential. WQBELs are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential (e.g., constituents were not detected in the effluent or receiving water at concentrations which exceed applicable water quality objectives); however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of...
effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

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

i. **Aluminum**

   Aluminum is the third most abundant element in the earth’s crust and is ubiquitous in both soils and aquatic sediments. When mobilized in surface waters, aluminum has been shown to be toxic to various fish species. However, the potential for aluminum toxicity in surface waters is directly related to the chemical form of aluminum present, and the chemical form is highly dependent on water quality characteristics that ultimately determine the mechanism of aluminum toxicity. Surface water characteristics, including pH, temperature, colloidal material, fluoride and sulfate concentrations, and total organic carbon, all influence aluminum speciation and its subsequent bioavailability to aquatic life. Calcium [hardness] concentrations in surface water may also reduce aluminum toxicity by competing with monomeric aluminum (Al^{3+}) binding to negatively charged fish gills.

(a) **WQO.** The Code of Federal Regulations promulgated criteria for priority toxic pollutants for California’s surface waters as part of section 131.38 Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California (California Toxics Rule or CTR), including metals criteria. However, aluminum criteria were not promulgated as part of the CTR. Absent numeric aquatic life criteria for aluminum, WQBEL’s in the Central Valley Region’s NPDES permits are based on the Basin Plans’ narrative toxicity objective. The Basin Plans’ Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives requires the Central Valley Water Board to consider, “on a case-by-case basis, direct evidence of beneficial use impacts, all material and relevant information submitted by the discharger and other interested parties, and relevant numerical criteria and guidelines developed and/or published by other agencies and organizations. In considering such criteria, the Board evaluates whether the specific numerical criteria which are available through these sources and through other information supplied to the Board, are relevant and appropriate to the situation at hand and, therefore, should be used in determining compliance with the narrative objective.” Relevant information includes, but is not limited to (1) USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) and subsequent Correction, (2) site-specific conditions of Hangtown Creek, the receiving water, and (3) site-specific aluminum studies conducted by dischargers within the Central Valley Region. (Basin Plan, p. IV.-17.00; see also, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(vi).)

**USEPA NAWQC.** USEPA recommended the NAWQC aluminum acute criterion at 750 µg/L based on test waters with a pH of 6.5 to 9.0. USEPA also recommended the NAWQC aluminum chronic criterion at 87 µg/L based upon the following two toxicity tests. All test waters contained hardness at 12 mg/L as CaCO₃.

(1) Acute toxicity tests at various aluminum doses were conducted in various acidic waters (pH 6.0 – 6.5) on 159- and 160-day old striped
bass. The 159-day old striped bass showed no mortality in waters with pH at 6.5 and aluminum doses at 390 µg/L, and the 160-day old striped bass showed 58% mortality at a dose of 174.4 µg/L in same pH waters. However, the 160-day old striped bass showed 98% mortality at aluminum dose of 87.2 µg/L in waters with pH at 6.0, which is USEPA’s basis for the 87 µg/L chronic criterion. The varied results draw into question this study and the applicability of the NAWQC chronic criterion of 87 µg/L.

(2) Chronic toxicity effects on 60-day old brook trout were evaluated in circumneutral pH waters (6.5-6.9 pH) in five cells at various aluminum doses (4, 57, 88, 169, and 350 µg/L). Chronic evaluation started upon hatching of eyed eggs of brook trout, and their weight and length were measured after 45 days and 60 days. The 60-day old brook trout showed 24% weight loss at 169 µg/L of aluminum and 4% weight loss at 88 µg/L of aluminum, which is the basis for USEPA’s chronic criteria. Though this test study shows chronic toxic effects 4% reduction in weight after exposure for 60-days, the chronic criterion is based on 4-day exposure; so again, the applicability of the NAWQC chronic criterion of 87 µg/L is questionable.

Site-specific Conditions. Effluent and receiving water monitoring data indicate that the pH and hardness values are not similar to the low pH and hardness conditions under which the chronic criterion for aluminum was developed, as shown in the table below, and therefore, the Central Valley Water Board does not expect aluminum to be as reactive in Hangtown Creek as in the previously described toxicity tests. The pH of Hangtown Creek, the receiving water, ranged from 7.1 to 8.9 with an average of 8.0 based on 499 monitoring results obtained between July 2008 and March 2013. These water conditions are circumneutral pH where aluminum is predominately in the form of Al(OH)₃ and non-toxic to aquatic life. The hardness of Hangtown Creek ranged from 46 mg/L to 146 mg/L based on 85 samples, which is above the conditions, and thus less toxic, than the tests used to develop the chronic criterion. Hangtown Creek supports aquatic species such as Chinook salmon and steelhead (rainbow trout). Brook trout and striped bass have not been surveyed nor expected to be present (http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/) since striped bass is non-native to California and would have to be introduced into Hangtown Creek, and brook trout is present in higher elevation lakes and streams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Test Conditions for Applicability of Chronic Criterion</th>
<th>Effluent</th>
<th>Receiving Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>6.0 – 6.5</td>
<td>6.6 – 8.0</td>
<td>7.1 – 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness, Total (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 – 67</td>
<td>46 – 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>87.2 - 390</td>
<td>&lt;14 – 73</td>
<td>17 – 370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Environmental Conditions and Studies. Twenty-one site-specific aluminum toxicity tests have been conducted within the Central Valley Region. The pH and hardness of Hangtown Creek are similar, as shown in the table below, and thus the results of these site-specific aluminum toxicity tests are relevant and appropriate for Hangtown Creek. As shown
in the following table, all EC<sub>50</sub> toxicity study result values are at concentrations of aluminum above 5,000 µg/L. Thus, the toxic effects of aluminum in surface waters within the Central Valley Region, including Hangtown Creek, is less toxic (or less reactive) to aquatic species then demonstrated in the toxicity tests that USEPA used for the basis of establishing the chronic criterion of 87 µg/L. This new information, and review of the toxicity tests USEPA used to establish the chronic criterion, indicates that 87 µg/L is overly stringent and not applicable to Hangtown Creek.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharger (City)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Test Waters</th>
<th>Hardness Value</th>
<th>Total Aluminum EC&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt; Value</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>WER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Ceriodaphnia dubia</td>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>&gt;5270</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>&gt;19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&gt;5160</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>&gt;12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>&gt;8800</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>&gt;8700</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>&gt;27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7823</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>&gt;9500</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>&gt;21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>&gt;11000</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>&gt;24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>&gt;9700</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>&gt;25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>&gt;9450</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>&gt;25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>&gt;11900</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>&gt;15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>Daphnia magna</td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>120/156</td>
<td>31604</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>120/156</td>
<td>31604</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>&gt;79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>&gt;5000</td>
<td>7.4 – 8.7</td>
<td>&gt;13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>120/156</td>
<td>&gt;8350</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>120/156</td>
<td>&gt;11900</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>&gt;79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>114/164&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&gt;8000</td>
<td>7.60/7.46</td>
<td>&gt;53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>Oncorhynchus mykiss      (rainbow trout)</td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>&gt;8600</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>120/156</td>
<td>&gt;16500</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>N/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>120/156</td>
<td>&gt;34250</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>&gt;229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface Water/Effluent</td>
<td>114/164&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&gt;8000</td>
<td>7.60/7.46</td>
<td>&gt;53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>†</sup> Hardness values may be biased high because the EDTA titrimetric method is subject to interferences that measure as hardness (barium, cadmium, lead, manganese, strontium, and zinc will be measured as hardness) producing hardness numbers that are likely to be greater than the calculation of hardness based upon the ICP analysis of calcium and magnesium. Upstream receiving water hardness ranged from 30 to 50.9 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> between January 2008 and August 2011. Furthermore, the upstream receiving water hardness was 37 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> on 4 October 2005, 7 days prior to the Feasibility Assessment (first phase of a Water Effects Ratio study) sample collection date of 11 October 2005. It is likely that matrix interferences from other metals were responsible for the unexpected hardness values reported by Pacific EcoRisk.

The Discharger has not conducted a toxicity test for aluminum; however, the City of Auburn conducted two toxicity tests in Auburn Ravine, shown highlighted in the previous table. The City of Auburn is located at an elevation of approximately 1,400 feet above sea level, and is surrounded by forest. As shown, the test water quality characteristics of Auburn Ravine are similar to Hangtown Creek, with the pH at 7.4 and hardness at 16 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> in comparison to the mean pH at 8.0 and the minimum hardness at 40 mg/L (mean hardness at 50 mg/L) as CaCO<sub>3</sub>, respectively. Thus, based on these two similar primary water quality characteristics (pH
and hardness) that drive aluminum speciation, the aluminum toxicity within Auburn Ravine is expected to be similar in Hangtown Creek. Therefore, the Auburn Ravine aluminum toxicity test study is relevant and appropriate in this case for use in determining the specific numerical criteria to be used in determining compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. The Auburn Ravine aluminum toxicity study resulted in a site-specific aluminum objective at 1,079 μg/L. Thus, these results support the conclusion that the 87 μg/L chronic criterion is overly stringent for Hangtown Creek.

Order R5-2008-0053 contained effluent limitations of aluminum based on the NAWQC chronic criterion of 87 μg/L. State of California Department of Public Health (DPH) has established Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) to assist public drinking water systems in managing their drinking water for aesthetic conditions such as taste, color, and odor. The Secondary MCL for aluminum is 200 μg/L. U.S. EPA has also adopted a NAWQC acute criterion of 750 μg/L for the protection of aquatic life.

(b) **RPA Results.** For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Aluminum is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent. The most stringent objective is the Secondary MCL, which is derived from human welfare considerations (e.g., taste, odor, laundry staining), not for toxicity. Secondary MCLs are drinking water standards contained in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Title 22 requires compliance with these standards on an annual average basis, when sampling at least quarterly. To be consistent with how compliance with the standards is determined, the RPA was conducted based on the calendar annual average effluent aluminum concentrations.

The maximum annual average effluent concentration for aluminum was 31 μg/L based on 16 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. Thus, annual average effluent concentrations for aluminum are less than the concentrations in the receiving water and below the Secondary MCL. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance in the receiving water and the Facility is adequately controlling the discharge of aluminum. Since the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential, the effluent limitations for aluminum have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

**ii. Atrazine**

(a) **WQO.** The DPH has adopted a Primary MCL for atrazine of 1.0 μg/L. Order R5-2008-0053 included an effluent limitation for atrazine based on the Primary MCL.

(b) **RPA Results.** Atrazine was not detected in the effluent based on 10 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 0.16 μg/L, minimum RL 1.0 μg/L). Atrazine was not detected in the
upstream receiving water based on four samples collected between July 2008 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 0.16 µg/L, minimum RL 1.0 µg/L). Therefore, atrazine the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCL of 1.0 µg/L, and the effluent limitation for atrazine has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

iii. Copper

(a) WQO. The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. These criteria for copper are presented in dissolved concentrations. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations.

(b) RPA Results. Section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet includes procedures for conducting the RPA for hardness-dependent CTR metals, such as copper. When conducting the RPA for CTR metals with hardness-dependent criteria, the maximum ambient background concentration is compared with the CTR criteria calculated using the upstream receiving water hardness. The maximum observed upstream total recoverable copper concentration was 5.7 µg/L on 16 May 2011. The observed hardness on that day was 56 mg/L, which correlates with a chronic criterion of 5.7 µg/L (as total recoverable). Therefore, the upstream receiving water does not exceed the applicable criteria for copper. As shown in the table below, an evaluation of the known situations where metals and hardness were measured indicates that there are no instances where the upstream receiving water exceeded the criteria for copper.

Table F-9. Copper Receiving Water CTR Criteria Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Date</th>
<th>RW Hardness (mg/L)</th>
<th>Copper CTR Chronic Criterion (µg/L)</th>
<th>RW Copper (µg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 September 2010</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November 2010</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February 2011</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 2011</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness was used to compare to the MEC. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CTR Chronic Criterion (Total Recoverable)</th>
<th>Maximum Concentration (Total Recoverable)</th>
<th>Reasonable Potential? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Water</td>
<td>5.7 µg/L^1</td>
<td>5.7 µg/L</td>
<td>No^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>4.3 µg/L^2</td>
<td>3.4 µg/L</td>
<td>No^4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on upstream hardness of 56 mg/L (as CaCO₃) which was collected on the same day (16 May 2011) as the maximum observed upstream receiving water copper concentration.

2 Based on reasonable worst-case effluent hardness of 40 mg/L (as CaCO₃).

3 Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.

4 Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.

Based on the available data, copper in the discharge does not have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life criterion, and the effluent limitations for copper have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

iv. Chlorodibromomethane

(a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.41 µg/L for the protection of human health for waters where both water and organisms are consumed. Order R5-2008-0053 included effluent limitations for chlorodibromomethane based on the CTR criterion.

(b) **RPA Results.** Chlorodibromomethane was not detected in the effluent based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 0.049 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). Chlorodibromomethane was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on four samples collected between July 2008 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 0.049 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). Therefore, the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR human health criterion of 0.41 µg/L, and the WQBELs for chlorodibromomethane have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

v. Cyanide

(a) **WQO.** The CTR includes maximum 1-hour average and 4-day average criteria of 5.2 µg/L and 22 µg/L, respectively, for cyanide, for the protection of freshwater aquatic life. Order R5-2008-0053 included effluent limitations for cyanide based on the CTR freshwater aquatic life criteria.

(b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for cyanide was 4.0 µg/L based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 4 µg/L, minimum RL 5 µg/L). Cyanide was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on four samples collected between July 2008 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 4 µg/L, minimum RL 5 µg/L). Therefore, cyanide in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria, and the effluent limitations for cyanide have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).
vi. **Dichlorobromomethane**

(a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.56 µg/L for the protection of human health for waters where both water and organisms are consumed. Order R5-2008-0053 included effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane based on the CTR criterion.

(b) **RPA Results.** The constituent was not detected in the effluent based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 0.31 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). The constituent was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on four samples collected between July 2008 and March 2013 (minimum MDL 0.31 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L). Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR human health criterion of 0.56 µg/L, and the WQBELs for the dichlorobromomethane have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

vii. **Iron, Total Recoverable**

(a) **WQO.** DPH has developed a Secondary MCL for total recoverable iron of 300 µg/L. Order R5-2008-0053 has established an effluent limitation for iron based on the Secondary MCL.

(b) **RPA Results.** For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Iron is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent. The most stringent objective is the Secondary MCL, which is derived from human welfare considerations (e.g., taste, odor, laundry staining), not for toxicity. Secondary MCLs are drinking water standards contained in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Title 22 requires compliance with these standards on an annual average basis, when sampling at least quarterly. To be consistent with how compliance with the standards is determined, the RPA was conducted based on the calendar annual average effluent iron concentrations.

The maximum annual average effluent concentration for iron was 43 µg/L based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. Although the receiving water contains iron exceeding the Secondary MCL, the effluent iron is consistently less than the concentrations in the receiving water and below the Secondary MCL. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance in the receiving water and the Facility is adequately controlling the discharge of iron. Since the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential, the effluent limitation for iron has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).
viii. **Manganese, Total Recoverable**

(a) **WQO.** USEPA has developed a Secondary MCL for total recoverable manganese of 50 µg/L. Order R5-2008-0053 established an effluent limitation for manganese based on the Secondary MCL.

(b) **RPA Results.** For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Manganese is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent. The most stringent objective is the Secondary MCL, which is derived from human welfare considerations (e.g., taste, odor, laundry staining), not for toxicity. Secondary MCLs are drinking water standards contained in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Title 22 requires compliance with these standards on an annual average basis, when sampling at least quarterly. To be consistent with how compliance with the standards is determined, the RPA was conducted based on the calendar annual average effluent manganese concentrations.

The maximum observed annual average effluent concentration for manganese was 34 µg/L based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance in the receiving water and the Facility is adequately controlling the discharge of manganese. Since the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential, the effluent limitation for manganese has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

ix. **Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)**

(a) **WQO.** DPH has developed a Secondary MCL for MTBE of 5 µg/L. Order R5-2008-0053 established an effluent limitation for MTBE based on the Secondary MCL.

(b) **RPA Results.** MTBE was not detected in the effluent based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. Therefore, the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Secondary MCL of 5 µg/L, and the effluent limitation for MTBE has not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

x. **Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides**

(a) **WQO.** 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; persistent 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. Persistent
chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides include aldrin; alpha-BHC; beta-BHC; gamma-BHC; delta-BHC; chlordane; 4,4-DDT; 4,4-DDE; 4,4'-DDD; dieldrin; alpha-endosulfan; beta-endosulfan; endosulfan sulfate; endrin; endrin aldehyde; heptachlor; heptachlor epoxide; and toxaphene. Order R5-2008-0053 included limits for the following individual persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides based on the Basin Plan objective: 4,4-DDD, dalapon, dinoseb, 2,4,5-TP, 2,4-D, beta-endosulfan; endrin; endrin aldehyde; and heptachlor.

(b) **RPA Results.** As shown in the following table, individual persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides (i.e., aldrin; alpha-BHC; beta-BHC; gamma-BHC; delta-BHC; chlordane; 2,4-D, 4,4-DDT; 4,4-DDE; 4,4-DDD; dalapon; dieldrin; dinoseb; alpha-endosulfan; beta-endosulfan; endosulfan sulfate; endrin; endrin aldehyde; heptachlor; heptachlor epoxide; 2,4,5-TP (Silvex); and toxaphene) were not detected in the effluent based on samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013 or the upstream receiving water based on samples collected between July 2008 and March 2013.

**Table F-10. Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticide Data Non-detect Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SIP ML</th>
<th>Minimum MDL</th>
<th>Minimum RL</th>
<th>No. of Effluent Samples Collected</th>
<th>No. of Receiving Water Samples Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldrin</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha-BHC</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-BHC</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma-BHC</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta-BHC</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlordane</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4-DDD</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4-DDT</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4-DDE</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalapon</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieldrin</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinoseb</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha-Endosulfan</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-Endosulfan</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endosulfan Sulfate</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin Aldehyde</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptachlor</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptachlor Epoxide</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4,5-TP (Silvex)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxaphene</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above Basin Plan objective or CTR criteria for persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides and the effluent limitations for the individual persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent
limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

xi. **Salinity**

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

Order R5-2008-0053 contained an interim performance-based annual average EC limitation based on current treatment plant performance of 850 µmhos/cm. Order R5-2008-0053 did not contain final limits for salinity parameters. The interim limitation was effective until 5 years after permit adoption (i.e., interim limit expired on 25 April 2013).

**Table F-11. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Agricultural WQ Objective</th>
<th>Secondary MCL</th>
<th>USEPA NAWQC</th>
<th>Effluent Average</th>
<th>Effluent Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC (µmhos/cm)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>900, 1600, 2200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDS (mg/L)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>500, 1000, 1500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate (mg/L)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>250, 500, 600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride (mg/L)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>250, 500, 600</td>
<td>860 1-hr 230 4-day</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parameter | Agricultural WQ Objective\(^1\) | Secondary MCL\(^2\) | USEPA NAWQC | Effluent Average | Maximum |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

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

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

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

2) Electrical Conductivity. The Secondary MCL for 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.

3) Sulfate. The Secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

4) Total Dissolved Solids. The Secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum. The Basin Plan contains a site-specific water quality objective for TDS of 125 mg/L for the South Fork of the American River.

(b) RPA Results

1) Chloride. Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 26 mg/L to 45 mg/L, with an average of 40 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in Hangtown Creek ranged from 5.8 mg/L to 13 mg/L, with an average of 9.2 mg/L, for four samples collected by the Discharger from July 2008 through March 2013.

2) Electrical Conductivity. A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows an average effluent EC of 406 µmhos/cm, with a range from 260 µmhos/cm to 540 µmhos/cm. The background receiving water EC averaged 246 µmhos/cm. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL.

3) Sulfate. Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 15 mg/L to 18 mg/L, with an average of 17 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in Hangtown Creek ranged from 7.9 mg/L to 16 mg/L, with an average of 12 mg/L.

4) Total Dissolved Solids. The average TDS effluent concentration was 242 mg/L with concentrations ranging from 156 mg/L to 310 mg/L. The State's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program obtained field measurements on six occasions between August 2008 and June 2013 from the South Fork of the American River downstream of the confluence with Weber Creek. The maximum field measurement for EC was 58 µmhos/cm, or a TDS concentration...
equal to 37.1 mg/L, which is below the Basin Plan objective. These levels do not exceed the Basin Plan site-specific TDS limit of 125 mg/L.

Based on the relatively low reported salinity, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity. However, since the Discharger discharges to Hangtown Creek, a tributary of the South Fork of the American River and eventually the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, of additional concern is the salt contribution to Delta waters. Allowing the Discharger to increase its current salt loading may be contrary to the Region-wide effort to address salinity in the Central Valley. Therefore, in order to ensure that the Discharger will continue to control the discharge of salinity, this Order includes a requirement to continue to implement their salinity evaluation and minimization plan. The interim effluent limitation for salinity has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

xii. **Settleable Solids**

(a) **WQO.** For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states that “[w]ater shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.” Order R5-2008-0053 established an AMEL of 0.1 ml/L and a MDEL of 0.2 ml/L for settleable solids to implement the narrative settleable solids objective.

(b) **RPA Results.** Settleable solids were not detected in the discharge based on 1,430 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. Therefore, the discharge from the Facility does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the Basin Plan’s narrative objective for settleable solids and the effluent limitations for settleable solids have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

xiii. **Sulfide**

(a) **WQO.** U.S. EPA has adopted a NAWQC instantaneous maximum criterion for sulfide of 2 µg/L. Order R5-2008-0053 included an effluent limitation based on the NAWQC.

(b) **RPA Results.** Sulfide was not detected in the discharge based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. Sulfide was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on four samples collected between July 2008 and March 2013. Therefore, the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC criterion of 2 µg/L, and the effluent limitation for sulfide has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

xiv. **Total Trihalomethanes**

(a) **WQO.** DPH has developed Primary MCL for total trihalomethanes of 80 µg/L. Total trihalomethanes include bromoform,
Order R5-2008-0053 established an effluent limitation for total trihalomethanes based on the Primary MCL.

(b) **RPA Results.** Total trihalomethanes are chlorine disinfection byproducts. The Discharger converted from chlorine disinfection to UV disinfection during the term of Order R5-2008-0053. Bromoform, chloroform, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane were not detected in the effluent discharge based on 12 samples for bromoform (minimum MDL 0.1 µg/L, minimum RL 2.0 µg/L), 17 samples for chlorodibromomethane (minimum MDL 0.049 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L), and 17 samples for dichlorobromomethane (minimum MDL 0.031 µg/L, minimum RL 0.5 µg/L) obtained between January 2010 and March 2013, which is after the Facility’s conversion to UV disinfection. Chloroform was detected in the discharge at a maximum observed concentration of 1.3 µg/L based on 17 samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. The maximum observed total trihalomethanes concentration for the discharge was 1.3 µg/L. Total trihalomethanes were not detected in the upstream receiving water based on four samples for each contributing constituent collected between July 2008 and March 2013. Therefore, total trihalomethanes in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCL, and the WQBEL for total trihalomethanes has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3. of the Fact Sheet).

b. **Constituents with Limited Data.** Reasonable potential cannot be determined for the following constituents because effluent data are limited or ambient background concentrations are not available. The Discharger is required to continue to monitor for these constituents in the effluent using analytical methods that provide the best feasible detection limits. When additional data become available, further analysis will be conducted to determine whether to add numeric effluent limitations or to continue monitoring.

i. **Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate**

(a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 1.8 µg/L for the protection of human health for waters where both water and organisms are consumed.

(b) **RPA Results.** Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is a common contaminant of sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment, and sources of detected bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate may be from plastics used for sampling or analytical equipment. “Clean techniques” are used to ensure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detections for monitoring bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate.

The Discharger collected 14 samples bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate between January 2010 and March 2013; however four of these samples were composite samples and did not utilize clean sampling techniques. Therefore, effluent samples obtained through composite sampling were not used for purposes of the RPA. The remaining 10 samples did not utilize a RL equal to the ML specified by the SIP (i.e., ML = 5 µg/L),
instead using either one that was too low (RL = 1.5 µg/L) or too high (RL = 10 µg/L) as shown in the following table.

### Table F-12. Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Date</th>
<th>Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate Results (µg/L)</th>
<th>MDL (µg/L)</th>
<th>ML (µg/L)</th>
<th>RL (µg/L)</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July 2009</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 January 2010</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 July 2010</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 September 2010</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2010</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November 2010</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November 2010</td>
<td>J 2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 January 2011</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 2011</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February 2011</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 2011</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July 2011</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 January 2012</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 July 2012</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Receiving Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 September 2010</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 September 2010</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 November 2010</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 November 2010</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February 2011</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2011</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 May 2011</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND = Non-Detect  
J = Detected but not quantified (J-Flag)  
Composite = Composite samples did not utilize “clean” sampling techniques.  
Grab = Grab sample utilizing “ultra-clean” sampling techniques.

SIP Section 2.4.2 states that the ML is the lowest quantifiable concentration in a sample based on the proper application of all method-based analytical procedures and the absence of any matrix interferences. Required MLs are listed in Appendix 4 of the SIP. Where more than one ML is listed in Appendix 4, the discharger may select any one of the cited analytical methods for compliance determination. The selected ML used for compliance determination is referred to as the RL.

An RL can be lower than the ML in Appendix 4 only when the discharger agrees to use an RL that is lower than the ML listed in Appendix 4. The Central Valley Water Board and the Discharger have no agreement to use an RL lower than the listed ML.

SIP Section 1.2 requires that the Central Valley Water Board use all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information, as determined by the Central Valley Water Board, to implement the SIP.
Section 1.2 further states that the Central Valley Water Board has the
discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in
implementing the SIP. Data reported below the ML indicates the data may
not be valid due to possible matrix interferences during the analytical
procedure. In addition, data reported above the ML do not meet the
requirements of the SIP and are insufficient for purposes of adequately
identifying and quantifying the constituent at concentrations which may
produce adverse effects in the receiving water.

Further, SIP Section 2.4.5 (Compliance Determination) supports the
insufficiency of data reported below the ML or RL. In part it states,
“[d]ischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent
limitation, for reporting and administrative enforcement purposes, if the
concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater
than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the RL.” Thus, if
submitted data is below the RL, that data cannot be used to determine
compliance with effluent limitations.

Data reported below the ML is not considered valid data for use in
determining reasonable potential. Therefore, in accordance with Section
1.2 of the SIP, the Board has determined that data reported below the ML
is inappropriate and insufficient to be used to determine reasonable
potential.

Monitoring data for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate using RLs that meet the
applicable SIP ML is not available. Therefore, there is insufficient
information to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to
cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR human
health criterion of 1.8 µg/L. This Order requires additional monitoring twice
per year using ultra-clean sampling techniques and using methods that
utilize the specified SIP ML.

c. Constituents with Reasonable Potential. The Central Valley Water Board finds
that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream
excursion above a water quality standard for ammonia, BOD₅, chlorine residual,
lead, mercury, nitrate plus nitrite, pH, total coliform organisms, TSS, and zinc.
WQBELs for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA
is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each
constituent is provided below.

i. Ammonia

(a) WQO. The NAWQC for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total
ammonia, recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum
concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day
average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based on
pH and temperature. USEPA also recommends that no 4-day average
concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. USEPA found
that as pH increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia
increased. Salmonids were more sensitive to acute toxicity effects than
other species. However, while the acute toxicity of ammonia was not
influenced by temperature, it was found that invertebrates and young fish
experienced increasing chronic toxicity effects with increasing
temperature. Because Hangtown Creek has a beneficial use of cold
freshwater habitat and the presence of salmonids and early fish life stages
in Hangtown Creek is well-documented, the recommended criteria for waters where salmonids and early life stages are present, were used.

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.1. The Basin Plan objective for pH in the receiving stream is the range of 6.5 to 8.5, however a site-specific pH limit of 8.1 has been established for discharges from the Facility as discussed in section IV.C.3.c.vii. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an organism, a pH value of 8.1 was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion is 4.64 mg/L.

A chronic criterion was calculated for each day when paired temperature and pH were measured using downstream receiving water data for temperature and pH. Rolling 30-day average criteria were calculated from downstream data using the criteria calculated for each day and the minimum observed 30-day average criterion was established as the applicable 30-day average chronic criterion, or 30-day CCC. The resulting 30-day CCC is 1.29 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 the 30-day CCC of 1.29 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 3.23 mg/L (as N).

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

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “[l]imitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Ammonia is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

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

Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger currently uses nitrification to remove ammonia from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream. Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. Discharges of ammonia in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Although the Discharger nitrifies the discharge, inadequate or incomplete nitrification creates the potential for ammonia to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for ammonia and WQBELs are required.

Ammonia was detected in the effluent at concentrations up to 10 mg/L based on data collected between January 2010 and March 2013; however, several elevated detections were due to operational issues. Per a letter from the Discharger dated 11 October 2013, effluent samples collected between 8 February 2010 and 8 March 2010 and 20 October 2010 and 25 October 2010 are suspected to be the result of operational issues relating to the mixed liquor suspended solids (MLSS) inventory and low dissolved oxygen concentrations in the aeration basins and an effluent sample collected on 11 February 2013 is suspected to be the result of the failure of an air inlet valve to the final aeration basin which reduced the dissolved oxygen concentration. Consequently, these samples are not considered to be representative of the effluent under normal operations and were not used in conducting the RPA or WQBEL calculations. Excluding these samples, the maximum observed effluent ammonia concentration was 3.7 mg/L, which exceeds the NAWQC chronic criterion.

(c) WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board calculates WQBELs in accordance with SIP procedures for non-CTR constituents, and ammonia is a non-CTR constituent. The SIP procedure assumes a 4-day averaging period for calculating the long-term average discharge condition (LTA). However, USEPA recommends modifying the procedure for calculating permit limits for ammonia using a 30-day averaging period for the calculation of the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC. Therefore, while the LTAs corresponding to the acute and 4-day chronic criteria were calculated according to SIP procedures, the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period. The
lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day CCC, and 30-day CCC is then selected for deriving the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and the maximum daily effluent limitation (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 1.6 mg/L as N and 4.7 mg/L based on the NAWQC. In addition, this Order contains a final mass-based AMEL and MDEL for ammonia of 31 lbs/day and 90 lbs/day.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Facility is designed to provide complete nitrification of the discharge. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

ii. **Chlorine Residual**

(a) **WQO.** USEPA developed NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

(b) **RPA Results.** The concentrations of chlorine used to disinfect wastewater are high enough to harm aquatic life and violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore does exist and effluent limits are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Chlorine is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

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

During the term of Order R5-2008-0053, the Discharger installed a UV disinfection system and removed the chlorine disinfection system from regular service. The Discharger retains a store of chlorine disinfectant and dechlorinating agent on-site for emergency use in the event of a failure in the UV disinfection system. The Discharger does not utilize chlorine containing cleaning agents in maintenance tasks at the Facility (e.g., filter backwash cleaning). Since the Discharger retains the ability to utilize chlorine disinfectant for emergency use and because chlorine is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms, the potential for chlorine to be discharged provides the basis to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC.

(c) **WQBELs.** The USEPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-hour) aquatic life criteria to average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations based on the variability of the existing data and the expected frequency of monitoring. However, because chlorine is an acutely toxic constituent that can and will be monitored continuously, an average 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.011 µg/L and 0.019 µg/L, respectively, based on USEPA’s NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** When chlorine disinfection is used, the Discharger uses sulfur dioxide for dechlorination. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

### iii. Lead, Total Recoverable

(a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for lead. These criteria for lead are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. Default USEPA translators were used for the receiving water and effluent.

(b) **RPA Results.** Section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet includes procedures for conducting the RPA for hardness-dependent CTR metals, such as lead. The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for lead for the receiving water. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness to compare the MEC. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CTR Chronic Criterion (Total Recoverable)</th>
<th>Maximum Concentration (Total Recoverable)</th>
<th>Reasonable Potential? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receiving Water</strong></td>
<td>1.2 µg/L$^1$</td>
<td>2.1 µg/L</td>
<td>Yes$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effluent</strong></td>
<td>0.91 µg/L$^2$</td>
<td>0.71 µg/L</td>
<td>No$^4$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on lowest observed upstream hardness of 46 mg/L (as CaCO$_3$)

Based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness as described in section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet.

Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.

Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.

Based on the available data, lead in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

(c) **WQBELs.** This Order contains a final AMEL and MDEL for lead of 0.79 µg/L and 1.3 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows the Facility can meet these WQBELs.

iv. **Mercury**

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

(b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for mercury was 0.0022 µg/L based on 17 samples collected from January 2010 to March 2013. The maximum upstream receiving water mercury concentration was 0.0133µg/L based on four samples collected from July 2008 to March 2013. Mercury bioaccumulates in fish tissue and, therefore, the discharge of mercury to the receiving water may contribute to exceedances of the narrative toxicity objective and impact beneficial uses. The South Fork of the American River, to which Hangtown Creek is tributary, has been listed as an impaired water body pursuant to CWA section 303(d) because of mercury and the discharge must not cause or contribute to increased mercury levels. In addition, a TMDL is under development for Folsom Lake downstream of the Facility which may include a waste load allocation applicable to the Facility.

(c) **WQBELs.** This Order contains a performance-based mass effluent limitation of 0.014 lbs/month for mercury for the effluent discharged to the receiving water. This limitation is based on maintaining the mercury
loading at the current level until a total maximum daily load (TMDL) can be established and USEPA develops mercury standards that are protective of human health. If USEPA develops new water quality standards for mercury, this permit may be reopened and the effluent limitations adjusted.

(d) Plant Performance and Attainability. Analysis of the effluent data shows the Facility can meet these WQBELs.

v. Nitrate and Nitrite

(a) WQO. DPH has adopted Primary MCLs 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. DPH has also adopted a Primary MCL of 10 mg/L for the sum of nitrate and nitrite, measured as nitrogen.

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

(b) RPA Results. The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that, if untreated, will be harmful to fish and will violate the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. This Order, therefore, requires removal of ammonia (i.e., nitrification). Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrate and nitrite, and will result in effluent nitrate concentrations above the Primary MCL for nitrate plus nitrite. Nitrate concentrations in a drinking water supply above the Primary MCL threatens the health of human fetuses and newborn babies by reducing the oxygen-carrying capacity of the blood (methemoglobinemia). Reasonable potential for nitrate and nitrite therefore exists and WQBELs are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “[l]imitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Nitrate and nitrite are not priority pollutants. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

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

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

(c) WQBELs. This Order contains a final AMEL for nitrate plus nitrite of 10 mg/L (total as N), based on the Primary MCL. 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.

(d) Plant Performance and Attainability. Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 7.6 mg/L as N is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

vi. Pathogens

(a) WQO. 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; 
23 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period; 
and 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

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

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

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, 
“[l]imitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either 
conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director 
determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the 
reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any 
State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water 
quality.” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for 
conducting the RPA. Pathogens are not priority pollutants. Therefore, the 
Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. 
Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley 
Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the 
appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant 
constituent.

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

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

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

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

This Order contains effluent limitations for BOD$_5$, total coliform organisms, and TSS, and requires a tertiary level of treatment, or equivalent, necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The Central Valley Water Board has previously considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Final WQBELs for BOD$_5$ and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. BOD$_5$ is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The tertiary treatment standards for BOD$_5$ and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the tertiary treatment process. 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. 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. Therefore, this Order requires AMELs for BOD$_5$ and TSS of 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. The MDEL of 30 mg/L from Order R5-2008-0053 has been revised to 20 mg/L to reflect the technical capability of the tertiary process and to be consistent with effluent limitations established in NPDES permits for other tertiary treatment facilities in the Central Valley Region.

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

vii. **pH**

(a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the “…pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.”

(b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently has variable pH. Additionally, some wastewater treatment processes can increase or decrease wastewater pH which if not properly controlled, would violate the Basin Plan’s numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, reasonable potential exists for pH and WQBELs are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. pH is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available…A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).” USEPA’s TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, “When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.” (TSD,
The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Based on 1,186 samples taken from January 2010 to March 2013, the maximum pH reported was 8.0 and the minimum was 6.6. The Facility did not exceed either the instantaneous maximum or minimum effluent limitation.

(c) **WQBELs.** Order R5-2008-0053 contained minimum and maximum effluent limitations of 6.5 and 8.0 at Discharge Point 001. The maximum effluent limitation of 8.0 is more stringent than required by the Basin Plan pH objectives and was based on the treatment capabilities of the Facility. The Discharger has requested that the maximum effluent limitation be revised from 8.0 to 8.1. Since the effluent pH has not exceeded 8.1 during the term of Order R5-2008-0053 and a pH of 8.1 is below the applicable water quality objective, this Order includes a maximum effluent limitation of 8.1.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the range of observed pH performance levels is within the bounds of the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

viii. **Zinc, Total Recoverable**

(a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. These criteria for zinc are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. Default USEPA translators were used for the receiving water and effluent.

(b) **RPA Results.** Section IV.C.2 of this Fact Sheet includes procedures for conducting the RPA for hardness-dependent CTR metals, such as zinc. The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for zinc for the receiving water. The maximum observed upstream receiving water zinc concentration was 20 µg/L, based on four samples collected between July 2008 and March 2013. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness to compare the maximum effluent concentration. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CTR Chronic Criterion (Total Recoverable)</th>
<th>Maximum Concentration (Total Recoverable)</th>
<th>reasonable potential? (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Water</td>
<td>62 µg/L¹</td>
<td>20 µg/L</td>
<td>No³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>55 µg/L²</td>
<td>63.8 µg/L</td>
<td>Yes⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on lowest observed upstream hardness of 40 mg/L (as CaCO₃)
² Based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness of 46 mg/L (as CaCO₃)
³ Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.
⁴ Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.
Based on the available data, zinc in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

(c) **WQBELs.** This Order contains a final AMEL and MDEL for zinc of 37 µg/L and 55 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC is greater than applicable WQBELs. Based on the sample results for the effluent, the limitations appear to put the Discharger in immediate non-compliance. CDO R5-2008-0054-01 provided a compliance schedule to achieve compliance with the final effluent limitations for zinc by 28 February 2015. Consistent with CDO R5-2008-0054-01, a compliance time schedule for compliance with the zinc effluent limitations is established in CDO R5-2008-0054-02, with compliance with final effluent limitations required by 28 February 2015, in accordance with Water Code section 13300, that requires preparation and implementation of a pollution prevention plan in compliance with Water Code section 13263.3.

4. **WQBEL Calculations**

   a. This Order includes WQBELs for ammonia, BOD₅, chlorine residual, lead, mercury, nitrate plus nitrite, pathogens, pH, TSS, and zinc. The general methodology for calculating WQBELs based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.4.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.

   b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from Section 1.4 of the SIP:

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   ECA &= C + D(C - B) & \text{where } C > B, \text{ and} \\
   ECA &= C & \text{where } C \leq B
   \end{align*}
   \]

   where:

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

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

   c. **Basin Plan Objectives and MCLs.** For WQBELs based on site-specific numeric Basin Plan objectives or MCLs, the effluent limitations are applied directly as the
ECA as either an MDEL, AMEL, or average annual effluent limitations, depending on the averaging period of the objective.

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

e. **Human Health Criteria.** WQBELs based on human health criteria, are also calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are set equal to the AMEL and a statistical multiplier was used to calculate the MDEL.

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

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

$$MDEL_{HH} = \left( \frac{\text{mult}_{MDEL}}{\text{mult}_{AMEL}} \right) AMEL_{HH}$$

where:

$\text{mult}_{AMEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL

$\text{mult}_{MDEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL

$M_A$ = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to $LTA_{acute}$

$M_C$ = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to $LTA_{chronic}$

**Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations**

**Discharge Point 001**

**Table F-13. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Average Monthly</th>
<th>Average Weekly</th>
<th>Maximum Daily</th>
<th>Instantaneous Minimum</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-day @ 20 °C)</td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>lbs/month</td>
<td>0.014²</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF PLACERVILLE  
HANGTOWN CREEK WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY  
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### Parameter | Units | Effluent Limitations
--- | --- | ---
|  | Average Monthly | Average Weekly | Maximum Daily | Instantaneous Minimum | Instantaneous Maximum |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
Zinc, Total Recoverable | µg/L | 37 | -- | 55 | -- | -- |

**Non-Conventional Pollutants**

Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N) | mg/L | 1.6 | -- | 4.7 | -- | -- |
--- | lbs/day^1 | 31 | -- | 90 | -- | -- |

Chlorine, Total Residual | mg/L | 0.011^3 | -- | 0.019^4 | -- | -- |

Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N) | mg/L | 10 | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Total Coliform Organisms | MPN/100 mL | -- | 2.2^5 | 23^6 | -- | 240

---

1. Based on an average dry weather flow of 2.3 MGD.
2. The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.014 lbs/month.
3. Applied as a 4-day average.
4. Applied as a 1-hour average.
5. Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.
6. Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

### 5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

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

#### a. Acute Aquatic Toxicity

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

For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Acute toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Acute whole effluent toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA. USEPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available…A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).” Although the discharge has been consistently in compliance with the acute effluent limitations, the Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater containing ammonia and other...
Acute toxicity pollutants. Acute toxicity effluent limits are required to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

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

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

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

**b. Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) As shown in Table F-14 below, a chronic toxicity level of 8 TUc was observed for C. dubia reproduction on 9 January 2013. This level exceeded the numeric monitoring trigger of 1 TUc and, consequently, the Discharger conducted four subsequent accelerated monitoring events. No toxicity was detected in the accelerated monitoring samples and the source of the transient toxicity observed in the January 2013 sample is unknown. As shown in Table F-15, no toxicity was observed in the preceding 12 3-species toxicity tests. Based on chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger from January 2010 through March 2013, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

**Table F-14. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Fathead Minnow Survival (TUc)</th>
<th>Fathead Minnow Growth (TUc)</th>
<th>Water Flea Survival (TUc)</th>
<th>Water Flea Reproduction (TUc)</th>
<th>Green Algae Survival (TUc)</th>
<th>Green Algae Growth (TUc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 January 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 July 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 October 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 January 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 July 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 January 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 July 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 October 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires quarterly chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring the Special Provisions also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation of toxicity is demonstrated.

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

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

\(^1\) In the Matter of the Review of Own Motion of Waste Discharge Requirements Order Nos. R4-2002-0121 [NPDES No. CA0054011] and R4-2002-0123 [NPDES NO. CA0055119] and Time Schedule Order Nos. R4-2002-0122 and R4-2002-0124 for Los Coyotes and Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plants Issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1496 AND 1496(a)
numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE workplan. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations

1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations

40 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 have been established in this Order for ammonia, BOD$_5$, and TSS because they are oxygen demanding substances. Mass-based effluent limitation have been established for mercury because it is bioaccumulative pollutant. Except for the pollutants listed above, mass-based effluent limitations are not included in this Order for pollutant parameters for which effluent limitations are based on water quality objectives and criteria that are concentration-based.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the design flow (Average Dry Weather Flow) permitted in section IV.A.1.e of this Order.

2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations

40 CFR 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) unless impracticable. However, for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting, USEPA recommends the use of a maximum daily effluent limitation in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for two reasons. “First, the basis for the 7-day average for POTWs derives from the secondary treatment requirements. This basis is not related to the need for assuring achievement of water quality standards. Second, a 7-day average, which could comprise up to seven or more daily samples, could average out peak toxic concentrations and therefore the discharge’s potential for causing acute toxic effects would be missed.” (TSD, pg. 96) This Order uses maximum daily effluent limitations in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for ammonia, lead, and zinc 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$_5$, chlorine residual, pH, total coliform organisms, and TSS, weekly average effluent limitations have been replaced or supplemented with effluent limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. The rationale for using shorter averaging periods for these constituents is discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The Clean Water Act specifies that a revised permit may not include effluent limitations that are less stringent than Order R5-2008-0053 unless a less stringent limitation is
justified based on exceptions to the anti-backsliding provisions contained in Clean Water Act sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 CFR 122.44(i).

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in Order R5-2008-0053, with the exception of effluent limitations for aluminum, atrazine, beta-endosulfan, chlorodibromomethane, copper, cyanide, 2,4-D, 4,4-DDD, dalapon, dinoseb, endrin, endrin aldehyde, dichlorobromomethane, heptachlor, iron, manganese, MTBE, pH, settleable solids, sulfide, 2,4,5-TP (silvex), and total trihalomethanes. The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in Order No R5-2008-0053. This relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

a. **CWA section 402(o)(1) and 303(d)(4).** CWA section 402(o)(1) prohibits the establishment of less stringent WQBELs "except in compliance with Section 303(d)(4)." CWA section 303(d)(4) has two parts: paragraph (A) which applies to nonattainment waters and paragraph (B) which applies to attainment waters.

i. For waters where standards are not attained, CWA section 304(d)(4)(A) specifies that any effluent limit based on a TMDL or other WLA may be revised only if the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limits based on such TMDLs or WLAs will assure the attainment of such water quality standards.

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

Hangtown Creek is considered an attainment water for aluminum, atrazine, beta-endosulfan, chlorodibromomethane, copper, cyanide, 2,4-D, 4,4-DDD, dalapon, dinoseb, endrin, endrin aldehyde, dichlorobromomethane, heptachlor, iron, manganese, MTBE, pH, settleable solids, sulfide, 2,4,5-TP (silvex), and total trihalomethanes because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for these constituents. As discussed in section IV.D.4, the removal or relaxation of WQBELs for these pollutants from Order R5-2008-0053 meets the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

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

As described further in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2008-0053 was issued indicates that aluminum, atrazine, beta-endosulfan, chlorodibromomethane, copper, cyanide, 2,4-D, 4,4-DDD, dalapon, dinoseb, endrin, endrin aldehyde, dichlorobromomethane, heptachlor, iron, manganese, MTBE, settleable solids, sulfide, 2,4,5-TP (silvex), and total trihalomethanes do not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in the receiving water. The updated information that supports the removal of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

---

1 "The exceptions in Section 303(d)(4) address both waters in attainment with water quality standards and those not in attainment, i.e. waters on the section 303(d) impaired waters list." State Water Board Order WQ 2008-0006, Berry Petroleum Company, Poso Creek/McVan Facility.
i. **Aluminum, Total Recoverable.** As discussed in Section IV.C.3 of the Fact Sheet, based on new aluminum toxicity studies developed by other dischargers in the Delta, the Central Valley Water Board finds that based on site-specific conditions of the Hangtown Creek, the chronic criterion (87 µg/L) recommended in U.S. EPA’s NAWQC for aluminum is not applicable and applied the acute criterion (750 µg/L) to interpret the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. Effluent monitoring data collected between January 2010 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Secondary MCL of 200 µg/L.

ii. **Atrazine.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data collected between July 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Primary MCL of 1.0 µg/L.

iii. **Copper, Total Recoverable.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data collected between July 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR aquatic life criteria.

iv. **Chlorodibromomethane.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data collected between July 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR human health criteria of 0.41 µg/L.

v. **Cyanide, Total.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data collected between July 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR aquatic life criteria of 5.2 µg/L.

vi. **Dichlorobromomethane.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data collected between July 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR human health criteria of 0.56 µg/L.

vii. **Iron, Total Recoverable.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Secondary MCL of 300 µg/L.

viii. **Manganese, Total Recoverable.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Secondary MCL of 50 µg/L.

ix. **MTBE.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Secondary MCL of 5.0 µg/L.

x. **Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data
collected between July 2008 and March 2013 for beta-endosulfan, endrin, endrin aldehyde, heptachlor, 4,4-DDD, dalapon, dinoseb, 2,4,5-TP (silvex), 2,4-D indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan criteria prohibiting detectable levels of persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides in the water column.

xi. **Settleable Solids.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan narrative objective.

xii. **Sulfide.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data collected between July 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the aquatic life NAWQC of 2 µg/L.

xiii. **Total Trihalomethanes.** Effluent data collected between January 2010 and March 2013, and receiving water monitoring data collected between July 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Primary MCL of 80 µg/L.

Thus, removal or relaxation of the effluent limitations for aluminum, atrazine, beta-endosulfan, chlorodibromomethane, copper, cyanide, 2,4-D, 4,4-DDD, dalapon, dinoseb, endrin, endrin aldehyde, dichlorobromomethane, heptachlor, iron, manganese, MTBE, settleable solids, sulfide, 2,4,5-TP (silvex), and total trihalomethanes from Order R5-2008-0053 is in accordance with CWA section 402(o)(2)(B)(i), which allows for the removal of effluent limitations based on information that was not available at the time of permit issuance.

c. **Turbidity.** Order R5-2008-0053 contained effluent limitations for turbidity. The prior limitations were solely an operational check to ensure the treatment system was functioning properly and could meet the limits for solids and coliform. The prior effluent limitations were not intended to regulate turbidity in the receiving water. Rather, turbidity is an operational parameter to determine proper system functioning and not a WQBEL.

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

The revised operational specifications for turbidity are the same as the effluent limitations in Order R5-2008-0053. These revisions are consistent with State regulations implementing recycled water requirements. 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 R5-2008-0053 and therefore does not allow degradation.

d. **Zinc.** The AMEL for zinc has been changed from Order R5-2008-0053, however, it is not less stringent. In this case, the waste load allocations (WLA) in this Order and the previous Order are identical. The WLA provides a definition of effluent quality that is necessary to meet the water quality standards of receiving water and is used to derive WQBELs that are used to enforce the WLA.
The new effluent data used to calculate WQBELs for this Order has different statistical variability (i.e., coefficient of variation is different) than used in Order R5-2008-0053. Changes in the coefficient of variation can result in small changes to the effluent limits. However, the slight changes in effluent limits do not allow for an increase in the pollutants discharged. The TSD states, “[s]ince effluents are variable and permit limits are developed based on a low probability of exceedance, the permit limits should consider effluent variability and ensure that the requisite loading from the WLA is not exceeded under normal conditions. In effect then, the limits must “force” treatment plant performance, which, after considering acceptable effluent variability, will only have a low statistical probability of exceeding the WLA and will achieve the desired loadings.” (TSD, p. 97) Therefore, although there are slight differences in the effluent limits, the WLA are identical, so the level of treatment needed to maintain compliance with the effluent limits remains the same. Consequently, the effluent limits are not less stringent than the previous Order, and there is no backsliding.

WQBELs for zinc were calculated based on 23 effluent samples collected between January 2010 and March 2013. This dataset is representative of the Facility effluent and required monitoring frequency to meet the effluent limits in the previous permit. Therefore, Central Valley Water Board staff considers this data to be the most representative and reliable dataset to use to determine current Facility performance and development of WQBELs.

4. Antidegradation Policies

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

This Order removes existing effluent limitations for constituents in which updated monitoring data demonstrates that the effluent does not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality criteria or objectives in the receiving water. This Order also includes a maximum effluent limitation for pH which is less stringent than was included in Order R5-2008-0053, but is still more stringent than the applicable Basin Plan objective. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the removal of the effluent limitations for aluminum, atrazine, beta-endosulfan, chlorodibromomethane, copper, cyanide, 2,4-D, 4,4-DDD, dalapon, dinoseb, endrin, endrin aldehyde, dichlorobromomethane, heptachlor, iron, manganese, MTBE, settleable solids, sulfide, 2,4,5-TP (silvex), and total trihalomethanes and the relaxation of the maximum effluent limitation for pH do not result in an allowed increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving water. Thus, the removal and relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on
flow and percent removal requirements for BOD₅ and TSS. Restrictions on flow, BOD₅, and TSS are discussed in section IV.B.2.a. 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.

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

This Order contains pollutant restrictions that are more stringent than applicable federal requirements and standards. Specifically, this Order includes effluent limitations for total coliform organisms 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 section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet. In addition, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

**Summary of Final Effluent Limitations**

**Discharge Point 001**

Table F-15. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</th>
<th>Basis¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20 °C)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day²</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Removal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day²</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Removal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Pollutants**
### Effluent Limitations Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Instantaneous</th>
<th>Instantaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>lbs/month</td>
<td>0.014³</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basis

- **CTR**: Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.
- **PB**: Based on the demonstrated performance capabilities of the Facility.
- **BP**: Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.
- **NAWQC**: Based on USEPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- **TTC**: Based on tertiary treatment capability. These effluent limitations reflect the capability of a properly operated tertiary treatment plant.
- **CFR**: Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 CFR Part 133.
- **SEC**: Based on USEPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- **MCL**: Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.
- **Title 22**: Based on CA Department of Public Health Reclamation Criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22).

### Non-Conventional Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Instantaneous</th>
<th>Instantaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day²</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine, Total Residual</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>0.011⁴</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.019⁵</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliform Organisms</td>
<td>MPN/100 mL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.2⁶</td>
<td>23⁷</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Toxicity</td>
<td>% Survival</td>
<td>70⁸/90⁹</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. DC – Based on the design capacity of the Facility.
2. TTC – Based on tertiary treatment capability. These effluent limitations reflect the capability of a properly operated tertiary treatment plant.
4. BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.
5. CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.
6. NAWQC – Based on USEPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
7. PB – Based on the demonstrated performance capabilities of the Facility.
8. SEC MCL – Based on the Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level.
9. MCL – Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.
10. Title 22 – Based on CA Department of Public Health Reclamation Criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22).

### Interim Effluent Limitations

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

### RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

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

A. Surface Water

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

a. pH. Order R5-2008-0053 established a receiving water limitation for pH specifying that discharges from the Facility shall not cause the ambient pH to change by more than 0.5 units based on the water quality objective for pH in the Basin Plan, and allowed an annual averaging period for calculating pH change. The Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to delete the portion of the pH water quality objective that limits the change in pH to 0.5 units and the allowance of averaging periods for pH. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA. Consistent with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order does not require a receiving water limitation for pH change.

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

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

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

b. **Temperature.** Order R5-2008-0053 contained a site-specific receiving water limitation V.A.15 which limits the instantaneous maximum and weekly average ambient receiving water temperature on a seasonal basis. Furthermore, the annual average ambient temperature is not to be increased by more 5°F relative to upstream conditions. These limits were developed on the basis of a 1-year initial investigative study to assess the temperature impacts of the discharge, entitled *Investigation of Water Temperatures in Hangtown Creek Above and Below the Hangtown Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant, Placerville, California, December 1999.* In 2003, the Discharger completed a supplemental temperature study entitled *Survey of the Aquatic Biological Resources and Seasonal Water Temperature Regime of Hangtown Creek, Placerville, California* (April 2003) and included recommendations for modifications to the receiving water limitation for temperature. With Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) staff concurrence (15 September 2005 letter), Central Valley Water Board staff approved the Discharger's study and implemented the following receiving water temperature limitations for the Facility, with the DFW-recommended site-specific ecological and temperature data and related considerations that are unique to this site.

As recommended by DFW in the 15 September 2005 letter, “The [Facility] effluent shall not cause the following at the R2 monitoring station:

- The annual average temperature to increase more than 5°F compared to the ambient (RSW-001) stream temperature;
- The maximum weekly average temperature to exceed 58°F during the period December 1 through April 30;
- The maximum weekly average temperature to exceed 67°F during the periods May 1 through May 31 and October 16 through November 30;
- The maximum weekly average temperature to exceed 72°F during the period June 1 through October 15th; and
• The maximum instantaneous temperature to exceed 77°F during the period June 1 through October 15."

In February 2011, the Discharger submitted an additional study entitled “Supplemental Evaluation of Temperature and Fish and Benthic Macroinvertebrate Communities of Hangtown Creek”. This supplemental study evaluated the efficacy of the site-specific receiving water limitations and of three secondary effluent evaporative cooling towers which were installed at the Facility during the 2009 upgrade. Based on monitoring data collected since January 2010, only one exceedance of the site-specific receiving water limits was observed. The Discharger’s supplemental study demonstrated that the discharge is not having an adverse effect on aquatic life in Hangtown Creek. The site-specific receiving water limitation for temperature has been retained in this Order.

c. Turbidity. Order R5-2008-0053 established a receiving water limitation for turbidity specifying that discharges from the Facility shall not cause the turbidity to increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTU based on the water quality objective for turbidity in the Basin Plan. The Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to limit turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA. Consistent with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order limits turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU.

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

This Order includes operational specifications that require the Discharger to operate the treatment system to insure that turbidity shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, and 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24 hour period, and 10 NTU, at any time. Because this Order limits the average daily discharge of turbidity to 2 NTU, the Order will be protective of the receiving water under all natural background conditions as defined in the Basin Plan’s revised water quality objective for turbidity. The relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation will protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses nor result in water quality less than described in applicable policies. The relaxation of the receiving water limitation is not expected to cause other impacts on water quality. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation is to the maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

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

B. Groundwater

1. Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility shall not cause the underlying groundwater to contain waste constituents greater than background quality or Water Quality Objectives, whichever is greater.

VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

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

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

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

a. Mercury. This provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order in the event mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted. In addition, this Order may be reopened if the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to NPDES permits.

b. Whole Effluent Toxicity. This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a 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.
c. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating CTR criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for lead and zinc. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.

d. **Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection Operating Specifications.** UV system operating specifications are required to ensure that the UV system is operated to achieve the required pathogen removal. UV disinfection system specifications and monitoring and reporting requirements are required to ensure that adequate UV dosage is applied to the wastewater to inactivate pathogens (e.g., viruses) in the wastewater. UV dosage is dependent on several factors such as UV transmittance, UV power setting, wastewater turbidity, and wastewater flow through the UV disinfection system. The UV specifications in this Order are based on the NWRI guidelines. If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV engineering study that identifies site-specific UV operating specifications that will achieve the virus inactivation required by Title 22 for disinfected tertiary recycled water, this Order may be reopened to modify the UV specifications.

e. **Dilution Credits/Mixing Zones.** Based on the available information, the worst-case dilution is assumed to be zero to provide protection for the receiving water beneficial uses and effluent limitations have been established in this Order without allowance for dilution within the receiving water. The Discharger has conducted an initial dilution/mixing zone study indicating that receiving water flow may be available to allow dilution credits and mixing zones. Should the Discharger finalize its dilution/mixing zone study consistent with the requirements of Section 1.4.2 of the SIP, this Order may be reopened to adjust effluent limitations based on allowable dilution credits/mixing zones.

2. **Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements**

a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) Based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from January 2010 through March 2013, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, this provision requires the Discharger to submit to the Central Valley Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if 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 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 toxicity before requiring the implementation of a TRE. Due to possible seasonality of the toxicity, the accelerated monitoring should be performed in a timely manner, preferably taking no more than 2 to 3 months to complete.

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

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

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


**Figure F-1**

**WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart**

1. **Regular Effluent Toxicity Monitoring**
   - **Test Acceptability Criteria (TAC)**
     - **Monitoring Trigger Exceeded?**
       - Yes
         - **Initiate Accelerated Monitoring using the toxicity testing species that exhibited toxicity**
         - **Effluent toxicity easily identified (e.g., plant upset)**
           - Yes
             - **Effluent toxicity easily identified (e.g., plant upset)**
             - No
               - No
                 - No
                   - Cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring
                 - Yes
                   - Yes
                     - **Implement Toxicity Reduction Evaluation**
         - **Effluent toxicity easily identified (e.g., plant upset)**
           - No
             - No
               - No
                 - No
                   - Re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 14-days from notification of test failure
                 - Yes
                   - Yes
                     - Make facility corrections and complete accelerated monitoring to confirm removal of effluent toxicity
               - Yes
                 - Yes
                   - Yes
                     - **Implement Toxicity Reduction Evaluation**
3. **Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

   a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** An Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity is required in this Order to ensure adequate measures are implemented by the Discharger to reduce the discharge of salinity to Hangtown Creek. The Discharger submitted an Evaluation and Minimization Plan on 23 January 2009. The Discharger shall continue to implement its salinity evaluation and minimization plan to continue to reduce the discharge of salinity to Hangtown Creek.

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

   a. **Filtration System Operating Specifications.** Turbidity is included as an operational specification as an indicator of the effectiveness of the filtration system for providing adequate disinfection. The tertiary treatment process utilized at this Facility is capable of reliably meeting a turbidity limitation of 2 nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) as a daily average. Failure of the treatment system such that virus removal is impaired would normally result in increased particles in the effluent, which result in higher effluent turbidity and could impact UV dosage. Turbidity has a major advantage for monitoring filter performance, allowing immediate detection of filter failure and rapid corrective action. The operational specification requires that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average; 5 NTU, more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period, and an instantaneous maximum of 10 NTU.

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

   The National Water Research Institute (NWRI) and American Water Works Association Research Foundation NWRI/AWWRF’s “Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse” first published in December 2000 and revised as a Third Edition dated May 2003 (NWRI guidelines) includes UV operating specifications for compliance with Title 22. For water recycling in accordance with Title 22, the UV system shall be an approved system included in the Treatment Technology Report for Recycled Water, December 2009 (or a later version, as applicable) published by the DPH. The UV system shall also conform to all requirements and operating specifications of the NWRI guidelines. A Memorandum dated 1 November 2004 issued by DPH to Regional Water Board executive offices recommended that provisions be included in permits for water recycling treatment plants employing UV disinfection requiring Dischargers to establish fixed cleaning frequency of lamp sleeves, as well as, include provisions that specify minimum delivered UV dose that must be maintained (per the NWRI Guidelines).

   For granular media filtration, the NWRI guidelines recommend a minimum hourly average UV dose of 100 mJ/cm². Therefore, this Order includes UV operating specifications requiring a minimum hourly average UV dose of 100 mJoules/cm².
(equivalent to 100 mJ/cm²) and a minimum hourly average UV transmittance of 55%, per the NWRI Guidelines. If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV engineering study that demonstrates a lower UV dose meets a Title 22 equivalent virus removal, this Order may be reopened to revise the UV operating specifications accordingly.

5. **Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)**
   a. The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on 2 May 2006. The Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for the General Order were amended by Water Quality Order WQ 2008-0002-EXEC on 20 February 2008. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than one mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMPs) and report all sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), among other requirements and prohibitions. Furthermore, the General Order contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows. The Discharger is enrolled under State Water Board General Order No-2006-003-DWQ.

   b. **Continuous Monitoring Systems.** This Order, and the Monitoring and Reporting Program which is a part of this Order, requires that certain parameters be monitored on a continuous basis. The Facility is typically staffed for 9 hours a day and unattended for 15 hours per day. Permit violations or system upsets can go undetected during this period. The Discharger has a system in place to automatically contact Facility operators in the event of alarms generated at the wastewater treatment plant. The Discharger is required to establish an electronic system for operator notification based on continuous recording device alarms. For any future facility upgrades, the Discharger shall upgrade the continuous monitoring and notification system simultaneously.

6. **Other Special Provisions**
   a. Consistent with Order R5-2008-0053, this Order requires wastewater to be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to DPH reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3 (Title 22), or equivalent.

7. **Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable**

**VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

Section 122.48 of 40 C.F.R. requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E, establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this facility.

A. **Influent Monitoring**
   1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (e.g., BOD₅ and TSS reduction requirements). The monitoring frequencies for flow (continuous), BOD₅ (2/week), and TSS (2/week) have been retained from Order R5-2008-0053.
B. Effluent Monitoring

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

2. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (continuous), pH (5/week), lead (1/quarter), mercury (1/quarter), ammonia (1/week), chlorine residual (continuous when in use), methylmercury (1/quarter), nitrate plus nitrite (1/week), and temperature (1/day) have been retained from Order R5-2008-0053 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters.

3. Monitoring data collected during the term of Order R5-2008-0053 indicates that the Facility has maintained compliance with the applicable effluent limitations for BOD$_5$, total coliform organisms, and TSS. Therefore, the effluent monitoring frequencies for BOD$_5$, total coliform organisms, and TSS have been decreased from 5/week to 3/week. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to determine compliance with the applicable effluent limitations and monitor the performance of the Facility.

4. Monitoring data collected during the term of Order R5-2008-0053 indicates that the Facility does not have reasonable potential for salinity. However, monitoring for electrical conductivity and total dissolved solids, indicator parameters for salinity, is necessary to characterize the discharge and ensure that the Discharger continues to implement adequate measures to reduce the discharge of salinity to Hangtown Creek. Therefore, the effluent monitoring frequency for electrical conductivity and total dissolved solids has been decreased from 2/week to 1/month. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to monitor the performance of the Facility.

5. Monitoring data indicates that the effluent has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives for zinc based on the effluent concentrations. Therefore, the effluent monitoring frequency for zinc has been increased from quarterly to monthly. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is necessary to determine compliance with effluent limitations and monitor the performance of the Facility.

6. Order R5-2008-0053 required effluent monitoring for hardness twice per week. Although monitoring for hardness is necessary to correctly adjust applicable water quality criteria for hardness-based metals, the Central Valley Water Board finds that monthly monitoring, conducted concurrently with metals analysis, is sufficient to characterize the effluent. Therefore, this Order reduces the monitoring frequency for hardness from twice per week to monthly.

7. Monitoring data collected over Order R5-2008-0053 term for beta-endosulfan, copper, chlorodibromomethane, cyanide, 4,4-DDD, dichlorobromomethane, endrin, endrin aldehyde, heptachlor, aluminum, atrazine, 2,4-D, dalapon, dinoseb, iron, manganese, MTBE, settleable solids, sulfide, total trihalomethanes, and 2,4,5-TP (Silvex) did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order R5-2008-0053.

8. This Order includes operational specifications for turbidity. This Order moves the point of compliance from the final effluent after disinfection to an internal compliance point following the filtration system and prior to the UV disinfection system. Therefore, monitoring for turbidity is required at Monitoring Location FIL-001, FIL-002, and FIL-003, and effluent monitoring for turbidity has not been retained in this Order.
9. As discussed in section IV.C.3.b.i of this Fact Sheet, bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is a common contaminant of sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment, and sources of detected bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate may be from plastics used for sampling or analytical equipment. Furthermore, monitoring data collected during the term of Order R5-2008-0053 did not utilize RLs that meet the required MLs from Appendix 4 of the SIP. Therefore, this Order retains semi-annual monitoring for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, but specifies that monitoring must be conducted using clean techniques to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present in the effluent discharge and using an RL that meets the required SIP ML (i.e., 5 µg/L).

10. In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring is required for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. Consistent with Order R5-2008-0053, this Order requires effluent monitoring for priority pollutants quarterly during the third year of the permit term. See Attachment I for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.

11. California Water Code section 13176, subdivision (a), states: "The analysis of any material required by [Water Code sections 13000-16104] shall be performed by a laboratory that has accreditation or certification pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 100825) of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 101 of the Health and Safety Code." The DPH certifies laboratories through its Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

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

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Consistent with Order R5-2008-0053, quarterly 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.

2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Consistent with Order R5-2008-0053, quarterly 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.
   b. **Monitoring Location RSW-001**
      i. The receiving water monitoring frequency and sample type for flow, dissolved oxygen, hardness, pH, electrical conductivity, temperature, and turbidity have been retained from Order R5-2008-0053.
      ii. In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires monitoring for priority pollutants and other pollutants of concern quarterly during the third year of the...
permit term, concurrent with effluent monitoring, in order to collect data to conduct an RPA for the next permit renewal. See Attachment I for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.

c. Monitoring Location RSW-002
   i. The receiving water monitoring frequency and sample type for dissolved oxygen, hardness, pH, electrical conductivity, temperature, and turbidity have been retained from Order R5-2008-0053.

2. Groundwater – Not Applicable

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Biosolids Monitoring
   Biosolids monitoring is required to ensure compliance with the biosolids disposal requirements contained in the Special Provision contained in section VI.C.6.a. of this Order. Biosolids disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation.

2. Water Supply Monitoring
   Order R5-2008-0053 contains water supply monitoring requirements which have not been retained in this Order. Due to the relatively low effluent salinity concentrations, the Central Valley Water Board finds that water supply monitoring is no longer necessary to evaluate salinity sources in the wastewater.

3. UV Disinfection System Monitoring
   UV system monitoring and reporting are required to ensure that the UV system is operated to adequately inactivate pathogens in the wastewater. UV Disinfection system monitoring is imposed to achieve equivalency to requirements established by DPH, and the NWRI/AWWARF’s “Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse.”

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Central Valley Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR’s for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the following:

- Publication of the Notice of Public Hearing (NOPH) for one day in the Placerville Mountain Democrat;
- Posting of the NOPH at the City Hall or County Courthouse;
- Posting of the NOPH at the nearest post office;
- Posting of the NOPH at the public entrance to the Facility; and
- Electronic posting of the NOPH on the City of Placerville’s website.
The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Central Valley Water Board’s website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/

B. Written Comments

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

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Central Valley Water Board, the written comments were due at the Central Valley Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on 12 December 2013.

C. Public Hearing

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

Date: 7 February 2014
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

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

D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements

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

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

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml

E. Information and Copying

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

F. Register of Interested Persons

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

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Elizabeth Thayer at (916) 464-4671.
## ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS FOR CONSTITUENTS OF CONCERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>MEC</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>CMC</th>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>Water &amp; Org</th>
<th>Org. Only</th>
<th>Basin Plan</th>
<th>MCL</th>
<th>Reasonable Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,4,5-TP (Silvex)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.096</td>
<td>&lt;0.096</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ND 50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-D</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.090</td>
<td>&lt;0.090</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ND 70</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4-DDD</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.00083</td>
<td>0.00084</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>31¹</td>
<td>360¹</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>750²</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.64²</td>
<td>1.29³</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrazine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.16</td>
<td>&lt;0.16</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ND 1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beta-Endosulfan</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.00092</td>
<td>&lt;0.00092</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 Inconclusive⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>860²</td>
<td>230³</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorodibromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.049</td>
<td>&lt;0.049</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80⁶</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.3⁷/5.7⁸</td>
<td>5.9⁷/8.1²</td>
<td>4.3⁷/5.7⁸</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyanide, Total (as CN)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>&lt;4.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalapon</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.13</td>
<td>&lt;0.13</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ND 200</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorodibromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.031</td>
<td>&lt;0.031</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80⁶</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinoseb</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.12</td>
<td>&lt;0.12</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ND 7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C</td>
<td>µhos/cm</td>
<td>406¹</td>
<td>259¹</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.0019</td>
<td>&lt;0.0019</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin Aldehyde</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptachlor</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.0018</td>
<td>&lt;0.0018</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>0.00021</td>
<td>0.00021</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>43¹</td>
<td>437¹</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.91³/1.2²</td>
<td>23³/30³</td>
<td>0.91³/1.2²</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.91³/1.2²</td>
<td>23³/30³</td>
<td>0.91³/1.2²</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>MEC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Water &amp; Org</td>
<td>Org. Only</td>
<td>Basin Plan</td>
<td>MCL</td>
<td>Reasonable Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>34¹</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.00216</td>
<td>0.0133</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl-tert-butyl ether</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.030</td>
<td>&lt;0.030</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrite</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>17¹</td>
<td>16¹</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfide (as S)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>&lt;0.84</td>
<td>&lt;0.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>242¹</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trihalomethanes</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80⁶</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55⁷/62⁸</td>
<td>55⁷/62⁸</td>
<td>55⁷/62⁸</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Note: All inorganic concentrations are given as a total recoverable.
MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration
B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect
C = Criterion used for reasonable potential Analysis
CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)
CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)
Water & Org = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)
Org. Only = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)
Basin Plan = Numeric Site-specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective
MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level
ND = Non-detect
NA = Not Available

Footnotes:
(1) Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the Secondary MCL.
(2) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 1-hour average.
(3) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 30-day average.
(4) See section IV.C.3.b of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F) for a discussion of the RPA results.
(5) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 4-day average.
(6) Represents the Primary MCL for Total Trihalomethanes which include bromoform, chlorodibromomethane, chloroform, and dichlorobromomethane.
(7) Criterion to be compared to the MEC.
(8) Criterion to be compared to the maximum upstream upstream receiving water concentration.
(9) See section IV.C.3.c of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F) for a discussion of the RPA results.
## ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>CMC</th>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>HH Calculation</th>
<th>Aquatic Life Calculation</th>
<th>Final Effluent Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH Calculations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described in section IV.C.2.c of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F), calculation of effluent limitations for the protection of human health and aquatic life are determined without the allowance of dilution credits.
ATTACHMENT I – EFFLUENT AND RECEIVING WATER CHARACTERIZATION STUDY

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

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

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

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

II. Monitoring Requirements.

A. Quarterly Monitoring. Quarterly priority pollutant samples shall be collected from the effluent and upstream receiving water (Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table I-1. Quarterly monitoring shall be conducted for 1 year (four consecutive samples, evenly distributed throughout the year) and the results of such monitoring be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, during the third year of the permit term. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.

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

C. Sample type. All effluent samples shall be taken a grab samples. All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples, unless not appropriate to meet analytical holding time requirements per 40 CFR 136. The effluent sample collection type and rationale shall be defined in the study work plan. All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples.

D. Additional Monitoring/Reporting Requirements. The Discharger shall conduct the monitoring and reporting in accordance with the General Monitoring Provisions and Reporting Requirements in Attachment E.
Table I-1. Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Maximum RL (µg/L or noted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,1-Dichloroethane</td>
<td>75343</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,1-Dichloroethene</td>
<td>75354</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,1,1-Trichloroethane</td>
<td>71556</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,1,2-Trichloroethane</td>
<td>79005</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane</td>
<td>79345</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,2-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>95501</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,2-Dichloroethane</td>
<td>107062</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>cis-1,2-Dichloroethene</td>
<td>156592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene</td>
<td>120821</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,3-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>541731</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,3-Dichloropropene</td>
<td>542756</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,4-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>106467</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Acrolein</td>
<td>107028</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Acrylonitrile</td>
<td>107131</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>71432</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bromoform</td>
<td>75252</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bromomethane</td>
<td>74839</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Carbon tetrachloride</td>
<td>56235</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chlorobenzene (mono chlorobenzene)</td>
<td>108907</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Chloroethane</td>
<td>75003</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2-Chloroethyl vinyl ether</td>
<td>110758</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chloroform</td>
<td>67663</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chloromethane</td>
<td>74873</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dibromochloromethane</td>
<td>124481</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>75274</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dichloromethane</td>
<td>75092</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>100414</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Hexachlorobenzene</td>
<td>118741</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Hexachlorobutadiene</td>
<td>87683</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Hexachloroethane</td>
<td>67721</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>91203</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The RLs required in these tables for priority pollutant constituents are established based on Section 2.4.2 and Appendix 4 of the SIP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Maximum RL $^1$ µg/L or noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tetrachloroethene</td>
<td>127184</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>108883</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene</td>
<td>156605</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Trichloroethene</td>
<td>79016</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Vinyl chloride</td>
<td>75014</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trichlorofluoromethane</td>
<td>75694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-Trifluoroethane</td>
<td>76131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Styrene</td>
<td>100425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xylenes</td>
<td>1330207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,2-Benzanthracene</td>
<td>56553</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,2-Diphenyldrazine</td>
<td>122667</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2-Chlorophenol</td>
<td>95578</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2,4-Dichlorophenol</td>
<td>120832</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,4-Dimethylphenol</td>
<td>105679</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,4-Dinitrophenol</td>
<td>51285</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2,4-Dinitrotoluene</td>
<td>121142</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2,4,6-Trichlorophenol</td>
<td>88062</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2,6-Dinitrotoluene</td>
<td>606202</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2-Nitrophenol</td>
<td>25154557</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2-Chlornaphthalene</td>
<td>91587</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine</td>
<td>91941</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3,4-Benzofluoranthene</td>
<td>205992</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4-Chloro-3-methylphenol</td>
<td>59507</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol</td>
<td>534521</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4-Nitrophenol</td>
<td>100027</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether</td>
<td>101553</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether</td>
<td>7005723</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Acenaphthene</td>
<td>83329</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Acenaphthylene</td>
<td>208968</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Anthracene</td>
<td>120127</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Benzidine</td>
<td>92875</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)</td>
<td>50328</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Benzo(g,h,i)pyrene</td>
<td>191242</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Benzo(k)fluoranthene</td>
<td>207089</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR #</td>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>CAS Number</td>
<td>Maximum RL $\mu$g/L or noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane</td>
<td>111911</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether</td>
<td>111444</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether</td>
<td>39638329</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate</td>
<td>117817</td>
<td>$5^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Butyl benzyl phthalate</td>
<td>85687</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Chrysene</td>
<td>218019</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Di-n-butylphthalate</td>
<td>84742</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Di-n-octylphthalate</td>
<td>117840</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene</td>
<td>53703</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Diethyl phthalate</td>
<td>84662</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dimethyl phthalate</td>
<td>131113</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Fluoranthene</td>
<td>206440</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Fluorene</td>
<td>86737</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Hexachlorocyclopentadiene</td>
<td>77474</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene</td>
<td>193395</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Isophorone</td>
<td>78591</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>N-Nitrosodiphenylamine</td>
<td>86306</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>N-Nitrosodimethylamine</td>
<td>62759</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine</td>
<td>621647</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Nitrobenzene</td>
<td>98953</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Pentachlorophenol</td>
<td>87865</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Phenanthrene</td>
<td>85018</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Phenol</td>
<td>108952</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pyrene</td>
<td>129000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>7429905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Antimony</td>
<td>7440360</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>7440382</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>1332214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barium</td>
<td>7440393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beryllium</td>
<td>7440417</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>7440439</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Chromium (III)</td>
<td>7440473</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Chromium (VI)</td>
<td>18540299</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>7440508</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cyanide</td>
<td>57125</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluoride</td>
<td>7782414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR #</td>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>CAS Number</td>
<td>Maximum RL $^1$ µg/L or noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>7439896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>7439921</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>7439976</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td>7439965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molybdenum</td>
<td>7439987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>7440020</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td>7782492</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>7440224</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thallium</td>
<td>7440280</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tributyltin</td>
<td>688733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>7440666</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>4,4'-DDD</td>
<td>72548</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>4,4'-DDE</td>
<td>72559</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Aldrin</td>
<td>309002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>beta-Endosulfan</td>
<td>33213659</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane</td>
<td>319857</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Chlordane</td>
<td>57749</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane</td>
<td>319868</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Dieldrin</td>
<td>60571</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Endosulfan sulfate</td>
<td>1031078</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Endrin</td>
<td>72208</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Endrin Aldehyde</td>
<td>7421934</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Heptachlor</td>
<td>76448</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Heptachlor Epoxide</td>
<td>1024573</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Lindane (gamma-</td>
<td>58899</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hexachlorocyclohexane)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>PCB-1016</td>
<td>12674112</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>PCB-1221</td>
<td>11104282</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>PCB-1232</td>
<td>11141165</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>PCB-1242</td>
<td>53469219</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>PCB-1248</td>
<td>12672296</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>PCB-1254</td>
<td>11097691</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR #</td>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>CAS Number</td>
<td>Maximum RL $^1$ µg/L or noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>PCB-1260</td>
<td>11096825</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Toxaphene</td>
<td>8001352</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atrazine</td>
<td>1912249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bentazon</td>
<td>25057890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbofuran</td>
<td>1563662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,4-D</td>
<td>94757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dalapon</td>
<td>75990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)</td>
<td>96128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate</td>
<td>103231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinoseb</td>
<td>88857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diquat</td>
<td>85007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diuron</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endothal</td>
<td>145733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethylene Dibromide</td>
<td>106934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>1071836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methoxychlor</td>
<td>72435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molinate (Ordram)</td>
<td>2212671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxamyl</td>
<td>23135220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picloram</td>
<td>1918021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simazine (Princep)</td>
<td>122349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thiobencarb</td>
<td>28249776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)</td>
<td>1746016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,4,5-TP (Silvex)</td>
<td>93765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diazinon</td>
<td>333415</td>
<td>0.015 µg/L$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chlorpyrifos</td>
<td>2921882</td>
<td>0.014 µg/L$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ammonia (as N)</td>
<td>7664417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>7440428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>16887006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diuron</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardness (as CaCO$_3$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foaming Agents (MBAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercury, Methyl</td>
<td>22967926</td>
<td>0.06 ng/L$^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitrate (as N)</td>
<td>14797558</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitrite (as N)</td>
<td>14797650</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Maximum RL (^1) µg/L or noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phosphorus, Total (as P)</td>
<td>7723140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific conductance (EC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulfide (as S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulfite (as SO(_3))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Disolved Solids (TDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present in the effluent and receiving water, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.

*Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for this constituent, which requires a maximum RL to determine reasonable potential and determine compliance with the TMDL.