ORDER R5-2017-0060

NPDES NO. CA0079901

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
CITY OF NEVADA CITY
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
NEVADA 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 Nevada City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Facility</td>
<td>City of Nevada City Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
<td>650 Jordan Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada City, CA 95959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada 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>Treated Municipal Wastewater</td>
<td>39º 15' 35.1&quot; N</td>
<td>121º 01' 50.7&quot; W</td>
<td>Deer Creek, tributary to Yuba River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Administrative Information

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Order was adopted on:</td>
<td>9 June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Order shall become effective on:</td>
<td>1 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Order shall expire on:</td>
<td>31 July 2022</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>31 July 2021</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>Minor discharge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I, PAMELA C. 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 9 June 2017.

Original Signed by

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer
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I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the City of Nevada City Wastewater Treatment Plant (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 waste discharge requirements (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 a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit authorizing the Discharger to discharge into waters of the United States at the discharge location described in Table 2 subject to the WDR’s in this Order.

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 H are also incorporated into this Order.

C. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law. The provisions/requirements in subsections 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 C.F.R. section 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 report and 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 R5-2012-0033 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 from the Facility, as the Facility is specifically described in the Fact Sheet in section II.B, 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.

E. Discharge of waste classified as 'hazardous', as defined in the California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 66261.1 et seq., is prohibited.

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 4. Effluent Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</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>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>--</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>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrite</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.69 MGD.

b. **Percent Removal**: The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.

c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity**. Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
   i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
   ii. 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.

d. **Total Residual Chlorine**. Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:
   i. 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
   ii. 0.019 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.

e. **Total Coliform Organisms**. Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:
   i. 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median.
   ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and.
   iii. 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

f. **Average Dry Weather Flow**. The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 0.69 MGD.

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 Deer Creek:
1. **Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than 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 concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCL’s) 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 MCL’s 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 natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F. Compliance to be determined based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.

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

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

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

B. **Groundwater Limitations - None**

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:
   i. **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.
   ii. **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.
   iii. **Change in sludge use or disposal practice.** Under 40 CFR section 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. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board. To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity’s full legal name, the state of incorporation if a corporation, address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Central Valley Water Board and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory and certification requirements in the federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D, section V.B) and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure
to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

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

q. In the event 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 of 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 five days, unless the Central Valley Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall state the nature, time, duration, and cause of noncompliance, and shall describe the measures being taken to remedy the current noncompliance and prevent recurrence including, where applicable, a schedule of implementation. Other noncompliance requires written notification as above at the time of the normal monitoring report.

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

   c. 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 to add effluent limitations. 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 add a mercury mass loading limitation and evaluate the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger. Additionally, if all the mercury data collected during the previous permit term is determined to be valid or
future mercury analytical results are above the human health criterion, then this Order may be reopened to include mercury effluent limitations based on the data.

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

e. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013 the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution No. R5-2013-0098 amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking Water Policy. The State Water Board approved the Drinking Water Policy on 3 December 2013. This Order may be reopened to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.

f. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** This Order includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of >1TUc that requires the initiation of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation or Toxicity Evaluation Study if exceeded. If the Discharger demonstrates that the monitoring trigger should be revised, this order may be reopened to adjust the toxicity monitoring trigger.

2. **Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements**

   a. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Requirements.** 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 Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, or conduct a Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES), 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. The Discharger may conduct an approved TES, individually or participate in an approved TES as part of a coordinated group effort with other dischargers. This Provision includes requirements for the Discharger to develop and submit a TRE Workplan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation that shall be followed if the Discharger has not been approved to conduct a TES.

   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.

Within sixty (60) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board a TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Workplan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating effluent toxicity. The TRE Workplan must be developed in accordance with USEPA guidance¹.

¹ See the Fact Sheet (Attachment F section VII.B.2.a.) for a list of USEPA guidance documents that must be considered in development of the TRE Workplan.
3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention
      i. The Discharger shall continue to implement the existing salinity evaluation and
         minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the Facility. The
         Discharger shall provide annual reports discussing the effectiveness of
         implementing the salinity evaluation and minimization plan. Discussion of the
         plan effectiveness shall include the following:

         (a) A description of the measures that have been implemented to address
             salinity in the discharge;

         (b) An assessment of the effectiveness of the implemented measures; and

         (c) The cost of implementing those measures.

         The annual reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and
         Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1).

      ii. The salinity evaluation and minimization plan shall be reviewed and updated if
          the effluent annual average calendar year electrical conductivity concentration
          is greater than 700 µmhos/cm. If the plan must be updated, it shall be
          submitted by 1 April following the calendar year in which the effluent
          electrical conductivity annual average of 700 µmhos/cm was exceeded.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications
   a. Filtration System Operating Specifications. To ensure the filtration system is
      operating properly to provide adequate disinfection of the wastewater, the turbidity
      of the filter effluent measured at Monitoring Location FIL-001 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.

5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)
   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 sludge 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 C.F.R. 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 C.F.R. part 503. If the State Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 C.F.R. 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 C.F.R. part 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.

iii. The onsite biosolids, treatment, processing, and storage, and offsite biosolids use or disposal for the Facility is described in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section II.A). Any proposed change in these biosolids practices shall be reported to the Executive Officer and USEPA Regional Administrator at least 90 days in advance of the change.

b. Collection System. On 2 May 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDR's 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 WDR’s. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under Order 2006-0003-DWQ for operation of its wastewater collection system.

c. 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 24/7 full time basis. However, the Discharger has a SCADA electronic system for operator notification for approximately 60 different alarm parameters that could cause a violation. Therefore, an operator is available on a continuous basis and will be notified immediately if an alarm is triggered.

6. Other Special Provisions

a. Title 22, or Equivalent, Disinfection Requirements. Wastewater shall be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to the State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW) reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3, (Title 22), or equivalent.

7. Compliance Schedules – None
VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

A. **BOD₅ and TSS Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.a. and b.).** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a. shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.b. for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD₅ and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

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

C. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.e.).** 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.

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

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

E. **Mass Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.a.).** 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:

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

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
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. **One Month Averaging Period for Receiving Water Limitations (Section V.A).** The turbidity sample values shall be collected as specified in Attachment E (Monitoring and Reporting Program). The sample values collected for the calendar month at Monitoring Location RSW-001 shall be added together and the total divided by the number of sample values. The sample values collected for the calendar month at Monitoring Location RSW-002 shall be added together and the total divided by the number of sample values. The difference between the two averages may then be calculated and used to satisfy the one-month averaging period allowance.
ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

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

\[ \mu = \frac{\sum x}{n} \]

where: \( \sum x \) 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.

Completely-Mixed Discharge
Completely-mixed discharge condition means not more than a 5 percent difference, accounting for analytical variability, in the concentration of a pollutant exists across a transect of the water body at a point within two stream/river widths from the discharge point.

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.

Dilution Ratio
The critical low flow of the upstream receiving water divided by the flow of the effluent discharged.

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.

Harmonic Mean
Expressed as \( Q_{hm} = \frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{x_i}} \), where \( x_i \) = specific data values and \( n \) = number of data values.

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 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.

Reporting Level (RL)
RL is the ML (and its associated analytical method) chosen by the Discharger for reporting and compliance determination from the MLs included in this Order. The MLs included in this Order correspond to approved analytical methods for reporting a sample result that are selected by the Central Valley Water Board either from Appendix 4 of the SIP in accordance with section 2.4.2 of the SIP or established in accordance with section 2.4.3 of the SIP. The ML is based on the proper application of method-based analytical procedures for sample preparation and the absence of any matrix interferences. Other factors may be applied to the ML depending on the specific sample preparation steps employed. For example, the treatment typically applied in cases where there are matrix-effects is to dilute the sample or sample aliquot by a factor of ten. In such cases, this additional factor must be applied to the ML in the computation of the RL.

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

Source of Drinking Water
Any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a 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.)

Water Effect Ratio (WER)
An appropriate measure of the toxicity of a material obtained in a site water divided by the same measure of the toxicity of the same material obtained simultaneously in a laboratory dilution water.
1Q10
The lowest flow that occurs for one day with a statistical frequency of once every 10 years.

7Q10
The average low flow that occurs for seven consecutive days with a statistical frequency of once every 10 years.
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 terms, requirements, and 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; permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a); Wat. Code, §§ 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 13001, 13304, 13350, 13385.)

2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants 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 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 (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, § 13267, 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 (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);

3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3); Wat. Code, § 13267, 13383); 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. (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

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 prior 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 must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O. Monitoring must be conducted according to sufficiently sensitive test methods approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analysis of pollutants or pollutant parameters or as required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O. For the purposes of this paragraph, a method is sufficiently sensitive when the method has the lowest ML of the analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, or when:

1. The method minimum level (ML) is at or below the level of the most stringent effluent limitation established in the permit for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, and:
   a. The method ML is at or below the level of the most stringent applicable water quality criterion for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, or;
   b. The method ML is above the applicable water quality criterion but the amount of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the facility’s discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the discharge;

In the case of pollutants or pollutant parameters for which there are no approved methods under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or otherwise required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapters N or O, monitoring must be conducted according to a test procedure specified in this Order for such pollutants or pollutant parameters. (40 C.F.R. § 122.21(e)(3), 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, 13383.)

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, V.B.5, and V.B.6 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 knowingly violated.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d).)

6. Any person providing the electronic signature for documents described in Standard Provisions – V.B.1, V.B.2, or V.B.3 that are submitted electronically shall meet all relevant requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B, and shall ensure that all of the relevant requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 3 (Cross-Media Electronic Reporting) and 40 C.F.R. part 127 (NPDES Electronic Reporting Requirements) are met for that submission. (40 C.F.R § 122.22(e).)

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 the results of monitoring, sludge use, or disposal practices. As of 21 December 2016 all reports and forms must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient, defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J, and comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (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 which 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 report shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time of the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The report 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.

For noncompliance events related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports must include the data described above (with the exception of time of discovery) as well as the type of event (combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events), type of sewer overflow structure (e.g., manhole, combined sewer overflow outfall), discharge volumes untreated by the treatment works treating domestic sewage, types of human health and environmental impacts of the sewer overflow event, and whether the noncompliance was related to wet weather.

As of 21 December 2020 all reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient (State Water Board) defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J. The reports shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3. They may also require the Discharger to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)

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 the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R.§ 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)
G. Anticipated Noncompliance

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Central Valley 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. For noncompliance events related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports shall contain the information described in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E and the applicable required data in appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 127. The Central Valley Water Board may also require the Discharger to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (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).)

J. Initial Recipient for Electronic Reporting Data

The owner, operator, or the duly authorized representative is required to electronically submit NPDES information specified in appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 127 to the appropriate initial recipient, as determined by U.S. EPA, and as defined in 40 C.F.R. section 127.2(b). U.S. EPA will identify and publish the list of initial recipients on its website and in the Federal Register, by state and by NPDES data group [see 40 C.F.R. section 127.2(c)]. U.S. EPA will update and maintain this listing. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(9).)

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 (POTW's)

All POTW's 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 State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Drinking Water (DDW; formerly the Department of Public Health). 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, dissolved oxygen (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. The Discharger must demonstrate sufficient capability (qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments, etc.) to adequately perform these field measurements. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Central Valley Water Board.

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

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

F. Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by DDW, 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 ensure that the results of the Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study or the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Resources Control Board at the following address:
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 E-1. Monitoring Station Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point Name</th>
<th>Monitoring Location Name</th>
<th>Monitoring Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>A location where a representative sample of the influent into the facility can be collected prior to any plant return flows or treatment processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 001                  | EFF-001                  | A location where a representative sample of the effluent from the facility can be collected after all treatment processes and prior to commingling with other waste streams or being discharged into Deer Creek.  
  [Latitude: 39 15' 35.1" N; Longitude: 121 01' 50.7" W] |
| --                   | RSW-001                  | 50 feet upstream from the point of discharge into Deer Creek.  
  [Latitude: 39 15' 35.1" N; Longitude: 121 01' 50.7" W] |
| --                   | RSW-002                  | 50 feet downstream from the point of discharge into Deer Creek.  
  [Latitude: 39 15' 35.1" N; Longitude: 121 01' 50.7" W] |
| --                   | FIL-001                  | Monitoring of the filter effluent to be measured immediately downstream of the filters prior to the chlorine disinfection system. |
| --                   | SPL-001                  | A location where a representative sample of the municipal water supply can be obtained. |

The North latitude and West longitude information in Table E-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 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>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>Grab 2</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite 3</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

#### A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

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

#### Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

<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 Composite</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>2/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Day</td>
<td>1, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Quarter</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylmercury</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Quarter</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern</strong></td>
<td>See Section IX.D</td>
<td>See Section IX.D</td>
<td>See Section IX.D</td>
<td>1, 5</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/Week</td>
<td>1, 3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>1, 3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine, Total Residual</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>1, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness, Total (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrite</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Day</td>
<td>1, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliform Organisms</td>
<td>MPN/100 mL</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>3/Week</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Quarter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Effluent Toxicity (see Section V. below)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</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. Grab samples shall not be collected at the same time each day to get a complete representation of variations in the influent.

3. 24-hour flow proportional composite.
V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

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

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

2. **Sample Types** – 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 for the first four quarters after the effective date of this Order and annually thereafter. Once the most sensitive species has been determined and approved the Discharger can perform the annual chronic toxicity testing with only the most sensitive species.

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 most sensitive species. The most sensitive species shall be selected from one of the following species and as described below:
   a. The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
   b. The rainbow trout, *Oncorhchus mykiss* (larval survival and growth test); and

5. **Most Sensitive Species Determination** – The Discharger shall determine the most sensitive species of the three test species specified above. The species demonstrating the highest percent effect at the instream waste concentration from the four monitoring events evenly distributed across the calendar year will be considered the most sensitive species and shall be used for chronic toxicity testing for the remainder of the permit term, except where documented issues with the sample analysis or related to the sample analysis prevent a clear selection of the most sensitive species. The Discharger shall request Executive Officer approval of the most sensitive species determination after conducting the four sets of quarterly chronic toxicity monitoring events. If the Executive Officer approval has not been received, all three species must be tested annually until Executive Officer approval is granted.


7. **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.

8. **Dilutions** – 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>% Effluent</td>
<td>100 75 50 25 12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Control Water</td>
<td>0 25 50 75 87.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **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 *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-
R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual), and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or

b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in Table 6 on page 52 of the Method Manual. (A retest is only required in this case if the test results do not exceed the monitoring trigger specified in the Special Provision at section VI. 2.a.iii. of the Order.)

C. WET Testing Notification Requirements. The Discharger shall notify the 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 with the monthly self-monitoring report, 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 annual 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 or TES Reporting. Reports for TREs or a TES 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 Location RSW-001 and RSW-002

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

<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>Dissolved Oxygen</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>Standard Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/Week³</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern (See section IX.C below)</td>
<td>See Section IX.C</td>
<td>See Section IX.C</td>
<td>See Section IX.C</td>
<td>2,6,7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>°F/°C</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week³</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Report both saturation concentration and percent saturation.
2 Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136.
3 Monitoring for pH and temperature shall be conducted concurrently with effluent ammonia sampling.
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 See List of Priority Pollutants and Other Pollutants of Concern in section IX.C and Table E-8 of Attachment E.
6 Priority pollutants shall be sampled once per calendar quarter in the year 2020 at RSW-001 only and shall be conducted concurrently with effluent monitoring for priority pollutants. See section IX.C and Table E-8 of Attachment E for more detailed requirements related to performing the priority pollutant monitoring.
7 Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Appendix 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.
8 In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present in the receiving water, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected pollutant.
9 Samples shall be collected on the same date as the effluent metals and priority pollutant samples.

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Municipal Water Supply

1. Monitoring Location SPL-001

a. The Discharger shall monitor the municipal water supply at SPL-001 as follows:

<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>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C¹</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
B. Filtration System

1. Monitoring Location FIL-001
   a. The Discharger shall monitor the filtration system at Monitoring Location FIL-001 as follows:

   **Table E-7. Filtration System Monitoring Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>Continuous*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *Report daily average and maximum turbidity.

C. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization

1. Quarterly Monitoring. Quarterly 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 E-8, below. Quarterly monitoring shall be conducted during 2020 (4 consecutive samples, evenly distributed throughout the year) and the results of such monitoring be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the monthly self-monitoring reports. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.

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

3. Sample Type. All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples. Effluent samples shall be taken as described in Table E-8, below.

   **Table E-8. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Sample Type</th>
<th>Maximum Reporting Level¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Chloroethyl vinyl ether</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolein</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrylonitrile</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromoform</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Tetrachloride</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorobenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroform</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloromethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibromochloromethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane²</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichloromethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexachlorobenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexachlorobutadiene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexachloroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Methyl-4-Chlorophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrachloroethene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Effluent Sample Type</td>
<td>Maximum Reporting Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichloroethene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl chloride</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichlorofluoromethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1,1-Trichloroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1,2-Trichloroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1-dichloroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1-dichloroethylene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-dichloropropane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3-dichloropropylene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-Trifluoroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-dichloroethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3-dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,4-dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styrene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xylenes</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-Benzanthracene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-Diphenylhydrazine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Chlorophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-Dichlorophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-Dimethylphenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-Dinitrophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-Dinitrotoluene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4,6-Trichlorophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6-Dinitrotoluene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nitrophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Chloronaphthalene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,3’-Dichlorobenzidine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4-Benzofluoranthene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Chloro-3-methylphenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nitrophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acenaphthene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acenaphthylene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthracene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzidine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzo(g,h,i)perylene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzo(k)fluoranthene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate²</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butyl benzyl phthalate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Effluent Sample Type</td>
<td>Maximum Reporting Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-n-butylphthalate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di-n-octylphthalate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diethyl phthalate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimethyl phthalate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoranthene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexachlorocyclopentadiene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isophorone</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Nitrosodiphenylamine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Nitrosodimethylamine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrobenzene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentachlorophenol</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenanthrene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antimony</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barium</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryllium</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium (Total)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium (VI)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyanide</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoride</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury^1</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molybdenum</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thallium</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributyltin</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4'-DDD</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4'-DDE</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,4'-DDT</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpha-Endosulfan</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachlor</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldrin</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beta-Endosulfan</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite^4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Effluent Sample Type</td>
<td>Maximum Reporting Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlordane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieldrin</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endosulfan sulfate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endrin Aldehyde</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptachlor</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptachlor Epoxide</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1016</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1221</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1232</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1242</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1248</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1254</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-1260</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxaphene</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrazine</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentazon</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbofuran</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-D</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalapon</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(2-ethylhexyl)adipate</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinoseb</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diquat</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endothal</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylene Dibromide</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methoxychlor</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molinate (Ordram)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxamyl</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picloram</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simazine (Princep)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thioencarb</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4,5-TP (Silvex)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diazinon</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorpyrifos</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boron</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow¹</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foaming Agents (MBAS)</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, Methyl</td>
<td>ng/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrite (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH³</td>
<td>Std Units</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus, Total (as P)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Effluent Sample Type</td>
<td>Maximum Reporting Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific conductance (EC) ³</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>24-hr Composite ³</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite ³</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfide (as S)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite ³</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfite (as SO₃)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite ³</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature ³</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) ³</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>24-hr Composite ³</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The reporting levels required in this table for priority pollutant constituents are established based on Section 2.4.2 and Appendix 4 of the SIP.
2 In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.
3 The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent monitoring for constituents that have already been sampled in a given month, as required in Table E-3, except for hardness, pH, and temperature, which shall be conducted concurrently with the effluent sampling.
4 24-hour flow proportional composite.

D. Biosolids – Not Applicable

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 (SMRs)

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit SMRs using the State Water Board’s California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program website http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/. The CIWQS website 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 SMRs including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMRs 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. Monthly SMRs are required even if there is no discharge. If no discharge occurs during month, the monitoring report must be submitted stating that there has been no discharge.

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

**Table E-9. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule**

<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>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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1/Quarter          | Permit effective date        | 1 January through 31 March  
1 April through 30 June  
1 July through 30 September  
1 October through 31 December | 1 May  
1 August  
1 November  
1 February of following year |
| 1/Year             | Permit effective date        | 1 January through 31 December | 1 February of following year |

4. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable Reporting Level (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 SMRs 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 waste discharge requirements; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.

   c. The Discharger shall attach all laboratory analysis sheets, including quality assurance/quality control information, with all its SMRs for which sample analyses were performed.

7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMRs calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:

   a. **Calendar Annual Average Limitations.** For constituents with effluent limitations specified as “calendar annual average” (electrical conductivity) the Discharger shall report the calendar annual average in the December SMR. The annual average shall be calculated as the average of the samples gathered for the calendar year.

   b. **Mass Loading Limitations.** For BOD₅, 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 (BOD₅ and TSS).** The Discharger shall calculate and report the percent removal of BOD₅ 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. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall report monthly in the self-monitoring report the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the effluent (EFF-001) and the receiving water (RSW-001 and RSW-002).

f. **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.

g. **Temperature Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the temperature increase in the receiving water based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.

C. **Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR’s)**

1. DMRs are U.S. EPA reporting requirements. The Discharger shall electronically certify and submit DMR’s together with SMR’s using Electronic Self-Monitoring Reports module eSMR 2.5 or any upgraded version. Electronic DMR submittal will be in addition to electronic SMR submittal. Information about electronic DMR’s submittal is available at the DMR website at: (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/discharge_monitoring/).

D. **Other Reports**

1. **Special Study Reports and Progress Reports.** As specified in the compliance time schedules required 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. At minimum, the progress reports shall include a discussion of the status of final compliance, whether the Discharger is on schedule to meet the final compliance date, and the remaining tasks to meet the final compliance date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table E-10. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan, Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan, if applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Discharger shall report the results of any special studies, acute and chronic toxicity testing, TRE/TIE, and TES required by Special Provisions – VI.C. The Discharger shall
report the progress in satisfaction of compliance schedule dates specified in Special Provisions – VI.C.7. The Discharger shall submit reports in compliance with SMR reporting requirements described in subsection X.B above.

3. The Discharger shall submit the following reports:
   
   a. **Routine Monitoring MDL/RL Report.** Within 60 days of permit adoption, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining reporting levels (RL’s), method detection limits (MDL’s), and analytical methods for the constituents listed in tables E-2, E-3, E-5, E-6, and E-7.

   b. **Characterization Study MDL/RL Report.** No less than 6 months prior to conducting the effluent and receiving water characterization monitoring required in Section IX.C, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining RL’s, MDL’s, and analytical methods for the constituents listed in Table E-8.

   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 reporting levels for priority pollutant constituents shall be based on the Minimum Levels (ML’s) 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 RL’s, 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 E-8 provides required maximum reporting levels in accordance with the SIP.

4. **Annual Operations Report.** By 1 February of each year, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing the following:

   a. The names, certificate grades, and general responsibilities of all persons employed at the Facility.

   b. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the plant for emergency and routine situations.

   c. A statement certifying when the flow meter(s) and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration.

   d. A statement certifying whether the current operation and maintenance manual, and contingency plan, reflect the wastewater treatment plant as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when these documents were last revised and last reviewed for adequacy.

   e. The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the 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 II.B of this Order, 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>CIWQS Facility Place ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Contact, Title and Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major or Minor Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat to Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Permitted Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Design Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Water Type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. The City of Nevada City (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the City of Nevada City Wastewater Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a publicly owned treatment works (POTW).

For the purposes of this Order, references to the “discharger” or “permittee” in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.
B. The Facility discharges wastewater to Deer Creek, a water of the United States, tributary to the Yuba River. The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2012-0033 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0079901 adopted on 7 June 2012 and expired on 1 June 2017. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

C. When applicable, state law requires dischargers to file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights and receive approval for any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that decreases the flow in any portion of a watercourse. The State Water Board retains separate jurisdictional authority to enforce any applicable requirements under Water Code section 1211. This is not an NPDES permit requirement.

D. The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its waste discharge requirements (WDR’s) and NPDES permit on 1 December 2016. The application was deemed complete on 5 January 2017. A site visit was conducted on 27 September 2016, to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge.

E. Regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.46 limit the duration of NPDES permits to a fixed term not to exceed five years. Accordingly, Table 3 of this Order limits the duration of the discharge authorization. However, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 2235.4, the terms and conditions of an expired permit are automatically continued pending reissuance of the permit if the Discharger complies with all federal NPDES requirements for continuation of expired permits.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the community of Nevada City and serves a population of approximately 3,150. The design daily average flow capacity of the Facility is 0.69 million gallons per day (MGD).

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

The wastewater treatment system consists of screening, grit removal, magnesium hydroxide addition, influent flow equalization and emergency storage, nitrification/denitrification, activated sludge, tertiary filters, chlorination, and dechlorination. The waste activated sludge is stored in an aerated day tank, dewatered by a belt filter press, and hauled to Ostrom Road Landfill in Wheatland, CA.

The screening consists of a Parkson HLS500 Hycor Helisieve automatic screen to remove inorganics larger than 1/4", grit removal occurs in a manually scraped grit channel. Magnesium hydroxide is added via a variable speed auger to maintain optimal pH in the nitrification/denitrification activated sludge process. Influent flow emergency storage or equalization is provided, as needed, in the original primary clarifier no longer needed with the new treatment process. Advanced secondary treatment is provided by two parallel nitrification/denitrification activated sludge processes (two basins and two secondary clarifiers).

Tertiary filtration is provided by a disk filter and sand filter in series operation (filters may also be run in parallel operation during high flow events or either filter may be isolated for maintenance). Effluent disinfection is achieved using chlorine. The final effluent is dechlorinated prior to discharge to Deer Creek.

Grit and bar screenings are hauled off-site to a landfill. Secondary waste activated sludge is stored in an aerated day tank (with emergency backup storage in the old anaerobic digester) then dewatered in a filter press. Biosolids are collected in a truck trailer before they are
hauled off-site to a landfill. No biosolids are treated, stored, or discharged onsite. Filtrate from the sludge dewatering process is returned to the activated sludge process for treatment with the incoming waste stream.

The Discharger has a year to year contract with Robinson Enterprises to haul the sludge. There is no contract with the Ostrom Road Landfill, but sludge is tested as required by the state to meet the requirements.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters
1. The Facility is located in Section 12, T16N, R8E, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.
2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point No. 001 to Deer Creek, a water of the United States and a tributary to the Yuba River at a point latitude 39° 16’ 35.1” N and longitude 121° 01’ 30.7” W.

C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data
Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2012-0033 for discharges from Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2012-0033 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Average Monthly Discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Average Weekly Discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Daily Discharge</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>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-day @ 20°C</td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% removal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.3</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>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% removal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5² – 7.7³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromo-methane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>359⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliform Organisms</td>
<td>MPN/100 mL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residual Chlorine</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.01⁶</td>
<td>0.02⁷</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.69 MGD.
2 Minimum.
3 Maximum.
4 Effluent limitation is municipal water supply plus 500 µmhos/cm, or 700 µmhos/cm, as an annual average, whichever is less.
5 Average annual.
6 As a 4-day average.
7 As a 1-hour average.
D. **Compliance Summary**

On 14 May 2013, the Assistant Executive Officer issued Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Order No. R5-2013-0540 for Mandatory Minimum Penalties (MMPs) in the amount of $3,000 for violations of ammonia and total coliform organisms effluent limitations occurring between 1 March 2010 and 31 December 2012. The ACL Order was settled by completion of the compliance project when a dissolved oxygen control system was installed into the aeration basins.

On 28 March 2016, the Assistant Executive Officer issued ACL Complaint No. R5-2016-0519 for MMPs in the amount of $12,000 for violations of dichlorobromomethane and total coliform organisms effluent limitations from 26 March 2015 to 30 September 2015. This matter was settled by payment.

E. **Planned Changes**

The Discharger does not plan on expanding or making any significant changes to the Facility during the next five years.

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.

C. **State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans**

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

   a. **Basin Plan.** The Central Valley Water Board adopted a Water Quality Control Plan for the Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised July 2016), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan.

   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 Deer Creek, but does identify present and potential uses for the Yuba River, to which Deer 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 Deer 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>Deer Creek, tributary to Yuba River</td>
<td>Existing: Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); Agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (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); Migration of aquatic organisms, warm and cold (MIGR); Spawning, reproduction and/or early development, warm and cold (SPWN); and wildlife habitat (WILD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential: None</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 ("Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California") (State Anti-Degradation Policy). The State Anti-Degradation Policy is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. The State Anti-Degradation Policy 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 the State Anti-Degradation Policy. The Board finds this order is consistent with the Federal and State Water Board antidegradation regulations and policy.

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 the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.

6. **Domestic Water Quality.** 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 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 C.F.R. 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 State Water Board does not require wastewater treatment facilities with design flows less than 1 MGD to obtain coverage under the Industrial Storm water 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 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. The Basin Plan references this list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), which are defined as “…those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 C.F.R. 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.” Deer Creek and the Yuba River are both listed on the 2010 303(d) list of impaired water bodies for mercury. At this time, no mercury Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) has been established for Deer Creek or the Yuba River.

2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL’s).** Table F-4, below, identifies the 303(d) listings and any applicable TMDLs. At the time of this permit renewal, there are no approved TMDL’s with wasteload allocations that apply to this Facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Potential Sources</th>
<th>TMDL Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>Resource Extraction</td>
<td>2016¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ A TMDL or new estimated completion date has not yet been established for mercury in Deer Creek.

3. The 303(d) listings and TMDL’s have been considered in the development of the Order. A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation of each pollutant of concern is described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

E. **Other Plans, Policies 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**

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 C.F.R. § 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 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that “are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality.” Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 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 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 WQBEL’s 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 C.F.R. section 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 C.F.R. § 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 C.F.R. section 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 C.F.R. section 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 C.F.R. section 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 C.F.R. section 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 C.F.R. section 122.41 et seq. that requires the proper design and operation of treatment facilities.

5. **Prohibition III.E (No discharge of hazardous waste).** This prohibition is based on California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 66261.1 et seq. that prohibits discharge of hazardous waste.

**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 POTW’s [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 at 40 C.F.R. part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary
treatment for BOD₅ and TSS. Tertiary treatment is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream and the final effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process. BOD₅ is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The secondary and tertiary treatment standards for BOD₅ and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the treatment processes. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD₅ and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. In applying 40 CFR Part 133 for weekly and monthly average BOD₅ and TSS limitations, the application of tertiary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD₅ and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed; the 30-day average BOD₅ and TSS limitations have been revised to 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of a tertiary system.

In addition to the average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations, a daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD₅ and TSS is also included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. In addition, 40 C.F.R. section 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. If 85 percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS must be achieved by a secondary treatment plant, it must also be achieved by a tertiary (i.e., treatment beyond secondary level) treatment plant. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS over each calendar month. This Order requires Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL’s) that are equal to or more stringent than the secondary technology-based treatment described in 40 CFR Part 133 (See section IV.C.3.d of the Fact Sheet for a discussion on Pathogens which includes WQBEL’s for BOD₅ and TSS.)

b. **Flow.** The Facility was designed to provide a tertiary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 0.69 MGD. Therefore, this Order contains an average dry weather discharge flow effluent limit of 0.69 MGD.

c. **pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units. This Order, however, requires more stringent WQBEL’s for pH to comply with the Basin Plan’s water quality objectives for pH.
Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point 001

Table F-5. Summary of Technology-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>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<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>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</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>8.0</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>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The average dry weather flow shall not exceed 0.69 MGD.
2. Note that more stringent WQBEL's for BOD₅, pH, and TSS are applicable and are established as final effluent limitations in this Order (see section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet).
3. Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.69 MGD.

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL’s)

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.C.3 of this 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, WQBEL’s 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 WQBEL’s when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in other state plans and policies, or any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.
2. **Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives**

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

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

The federal CWA section 101(a)(2), states: “it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1, 1983.” Federal Regulations, developed to implement the requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the State regulated to protect the beneficial uses of public water supply, protection and propagation of fish, shell fish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation. 40 C.F.R. section 131.3(e) 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 C.F.R. 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.

b. **Effluent and Ambient Background Data.** The reasonable potential analysis (RPA), as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data from June 2013 through May 2016, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMRs and Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).

SIP section 1.2 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. Copper data from the ROWD first reported a maximum effluent concentration (MEC) of 9.2 µg/L. The next highest result from the ROWD is 1.8 µg/L. Examination of the QA/QC reports for copper revealed a reporting limit (RL) of 25 µg/L for the lab control sample and matrix spike. With the RL of 25 µg/L, the MEC should have been j-flagged as an estimated value, and therefore, it was not considered in the RPA because it is an estimated value.

c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.** In the ROWD, the Discharger requested a dilution credit of 7.28:1 for human health constituents based on the Deer Creek harmonic mean flow of 5.02 MGD and a discharge flow of 0.69 MGD. The constituents with effluent limitations in this Order that are based on human health criteria include dichlorobromomethane.

The CWA directs the states to adopt water quality standards to protect the quality of its waters. USEPA’s current water quality standards regulation authorizes states to
adopt general policies, such as mixing zones, to implement state water quality standards (40 CFR § 122.44 and 122.45). The USEPA allows states to have broad flexibility in designing its mixing zone policies. Primary policy and guidance on determining mixing zone and dilution credits is provided by the SIP and the Basin Plan. If no procedure applies in the SIP or the Basin Plan, then the Central Valley Water Board may use the USEPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control (EPA/505/2-90-001)(TSD).

For non-Priority Pollutant constituents the allowance of mixing zones by the Central Valley Water Board is discussed in the Basin Plan, Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives, which states in part, "In conjunction with the issuance of NPDES and storm water permits, the Regional Board may designate mixing zones within which water quality objectives will not apply provided the discharger has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Board that the mixing zone will not adversely impact beneficial uses. If allowed, different mixing zones may be designated for different types of objectives, including, but not limited to, acute aquatic life objectives, chronic aquatic life objectives, human health objectives, and acute and chronic whole effluent toxicity objectives, depending in part on the averaging period over which the objectives apply. In determining the size of such mixing zones, the Regional Board will consider the applicable procedures and guidelines in the EPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook and the [TSD]. Pursuant to EPA guidelines, mixing zones designated for acute aquatic life objectives will generally be limited to a small zone of initial dilution in the immediate vicinity of the discharge."

For Priority Pollutants, the SIP supersedes the Basin Plan mixing zone provisions. Section 1.4.2 of the SIP states, in part, “…with the exception of effluent limitations derived from TMDL’s, in establishing and determining compliance with effluent limitations for applicable human health, acute aquatic life, or chronic aquatic life priority pollutant criteria/objectives or the toxicity objective for aquatic life protection in a basin plan, the Regional Board may grant mixing zones and dilution credits to dischargers…The applicable priority pollutant criteria and objectives are to be met through a water body except within any mixing zone granted by the Regional Board. **The allowance of mixing zones is discretionary and shall be determined on a discharge-by-discharge basis.** The Regional Board may consider allowing mixing zones and dilution credits only for discharges with a physically identifiable point of discharge that is regulated through an NPDES permit issued by the Regional Board.” [emphasis added]

For incompletely-mixed discharges, the Discharger must complete an independent mixing zone study to demonstrate to the Central Valley Water Board that a dilution credit is appropriate. In granting a mixing zone, Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires the following to be met:

**“A mixing zone shall be as small as practicable.** The following conditions must be met in allowing a mixing zone: [emphasis added]

A: A mixing zone shall not:
1. compromise the integrity of the entire water body;
2. cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone;
3. restrict the passage of aquatic life;
4. adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or State endangered species laws;
5. produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life;
6. result in floating debris, oil, or scum;
7. produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity;
8. cause objectionable bottom deposits;
9. cause nuisance;
10. dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls; or
11. be allowed at or near any drinking water intake. A mixing zone is not a source of drinking water. To the extent of any conflict between this determination and the Sources of Drinking Water Policy (Resolution No. 88-63), this SIP supersedes the provisions of that policy.”

Section 1.4.2.1 of the SIP establishes the authority for the Central Valley Water Board to consider dilution credits based on the mixing zone conditions in a receiving water. Section 1.4.2.1 in part states:

“The dilution credit, D, is a numerical value associated with the mixing zone that accounts for the receiving water entrained into the discharge. The dilution credit is a value used in the calculation of effluent limitations (described in Section 1.4). Dilution credits may be limited or denied on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis, which may result in a dilution credit for all, some, or no priority pollutants in the discharge.” [emphasis added]

Deer Creek is a year-round stream, and therefore, dilution is considered for year-round discharge. The Discharger is in the process of installing a stream flow gauge to collect flow data. Currently, there is not an adequate amount of flow data from the Deer Creek gauge station; however, Deer Creek is highly influenced by Nevada Irrigation District (NID). NID operates two reservoirs upstream of the discharge and uses this reach of the creek as a conduit to divert water used for agricultural purposes at a point approximately 36,000 feet downstream of the discharge. There are no other major tributaries into or diversion from Deer Creek along this reach of the creek. Therefore, the Discharge used flow data from NID’s downstream diversion to calculate a conservative harmonic mean flow (NID does not divert all of Deer Creek’s water). Monitoring data from January 1995 through December 2009 was used to determine NID’s median daily diversion flow. The Facility’s effluent daily discharge flow (0.4 MGD) was subtracted from NID’s median daily diversion flow and the resulting harmonic mean flow in Deer Creek equated to 5.02 MGD.

The Discharge submitted City of Nevada City Mixing Zone and Dilution Study for Carcinogens: Carbon Tetrachloride and Dichlorobromomethane (Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.) dated May 2011. The mixing zone field study was conducted on 18 November 2010, when Deer Creek flows are expected to be low and stable. Field conditions were found to be representative of mixing conditions under the estimated 5.02 MGD harmonic mean flow. Under low flow conditions, Deer Creek pinches down to narrow chutes of water before plunging into pools. Thus, electrical conductivity cross-sectional profiles were measured at the end of pools downstream of these hydraulic-pinch points. Three measurements were obtained upstream and four measurements were obtained downstream. Based on field measurements,
complete mixing was determined to be 236 feet downstream of the effluent discharge, which is the end of the proposed mixing zone. Based on the average dry weather flow effluent limit of 0.69 MGD and the harmonic mean of 5.02 MGD, the calculated dilution credit equates to 7.28:1.

To fully comply with all applicable laws, regulations and policies of the State, Central Valley Water Board approved a mixing zone and the associated dilution credits based on the following:

i. Mixing zones are allowed under the SIP provided all elements contained in Section 1.4.2.2 are met. Based on the mixing zone study conducted by the Discharger the Central Valley Water Board has determined that these factors are met.

ii. Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires mixing zones to be as small as practicable. Based on the mixing zone study conducted by the Discharger the Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zone is as small as practicable.

iii. In accordance with Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP, the Board has determined the mixing zone is as small as practicable, will not compromise the integrity of the entire water body, restrict the passage of aquatic life, dominate the water body or overlap existing mixing zones from different outfalls. The mixing zone is small (approximately 236 feet downstream of the discharge) relative to the large size of the receiving water (approximately 7 miles), is not at or near a drinking water intake, and does not overlap a mixing zone from a different outfall.

iv. The Central Valley Water Board is allowing a mixing zone for human health constituents only and has determined allowing such mixing zone will not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone.

v. The Central Valley Water Board has determined the discharge will not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under the federal or State endangered species laws, because the mixing zone is for human health criteria only, is relatively small, and acutely toxic conditions will not occur in the mixing zone. The discharge will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum, produce objectionable odor, taste, or turbidity, cause objectionable bottom deposits, or cause nuisance, because the proposed Order establishes end-of-pipe effluent limitations (e.g., for BOD₅ and TSS) and discharge prohibitions to prevent these conditions from occurring.

vi. As required by the SIP, in determining the extent of or whether to allow a mixing zone and dilution credit, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the presence of pollutants in the discharge that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, teratogenic, persistent, bioaccumulative, or attractive to aquatic organisms, and concluded that the allowance of the mixing zone and dilution credit is adequately protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

vii. The Central Valley Water Board has determined mixing zone complies with the SIP for priority pollutants.

viii. The mixing zone study indicates the maximum allowed dilution factor to be 7.28:1 for human health constituents. Section 1.4.2.2B of the SIP, in part states, “The RWQCB shall deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to protect beneficial uses, meet the conditions of this
Policy, or comply with other regulatory requirements.” The Central Valley Water Board has determined a dilution factor of 7.28:1 is needed for dichlorobromomethane for the Discharger to achieve compliance with this Order. This represents a mixing zone that is as small as practicable for this Facility and that fully complies with the SIP.

ix. The Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zone complies with the Basin Plan for non-priority pollutants. The Basin Plan requires a mixing zone not adversely impact beneficial uses. Beneficial uses will not be adversely affected for the same reasons discussed above. In determining the size of the mixing zone, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the procedures and guidelines in Section 5.1 of USEPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook, 2nd Edition (updated July 2007) and Section 2.2.2 of the TSD. The SIP incorporates the same guidelines.

x. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that allowing dilution factors that exceed those proposed by this Order would not comply with the State Anti-degradation Policy for receiving waters outside the allowable mixing zone for dichlorobromomethane. The State Water Board established California’s antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy and requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. Item 2 of the State Anti-Degradation Policy states:

“Any activity which produces or may produce a waste or increased volume or concentration of waste and which dischargers or proposed to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.”

The effluent limitations established in the Order for dichlorobromomethane and that have been adjusted for dilution credits were developed based on performance of the Discharger’s current wastewater treatment capabilities. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board determined the effluent limitations required by this Order will result in the Discharger implementing best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained. The Central Valley Water Board also determined the Discharger will be in immediate compliance with the effluent limitations.

The Central Valley Water Board also determined establishing effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane that have been adjusted for dilution credits is consistent with Section 1.4.2.2B of the SIP that requires the Central Valley Water Board to shall deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to comply with other regulatory requirements.

xi. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board has determined the effluent limitations established in the Order for dichlorobromomethane that have been adjusted for dilution credits are appropriate and necessary to comply with the
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 CTR and the NTR 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 hardness of the receiving water (actual ambient hardness) as required by the SIP\(^1\) and the CTR\(^2\). The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. The CTR requires that the hardness values used shall be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones\(^3\). Where design flows for aquatic life criteria include the lowest one-day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (1Q10) and the lowest average seven consecutive day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (7Q10).\(^4\)

This section of the CTR also indicates that the design conditions should be established such that the appropriate criteria are not exceeded more than once in a three year period on average.\(^5\) The CTR requires that when mixing zones are allowed the CTR criteria apply at the edge of the mixing zone, otherwise the criteria apply throughout the water body including at the point of discharge.\(^6\) The CTR does not define the term “ambient,” as applied in the regulations. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board has considerable discretion to consider upstream and downstream ambient conditions when establishing the appropriate water quality criteria that fully complies with the CTR and SIP.

**Summary findings**

The ambient hardness for the Deer Creek is represented by the data in Figure F-1, below, which shows ambient hardness ranging from 68 mg/L to 142 mg/L based on collected ambient data from June 2013 through May 2016. Given the high variability in ambient hardness values, there is no single hardness value that describes the ambient receiving water for all possible scenarios (e.g., minimum, maximum). Because of this variability, staff has determined that based on the ambient hardness concentrations measured in the receiving water, the Central Valley Water Board has discretion to select ambient hardness values within the range of 16 mg/L (minimum) up to 142 mg/L (maximum). Staff recommends that 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 (40 C.F.R. § 131.38(c)(4)).
3. 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(4)(ii)
4. 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4
5. 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4, notes 1 and 2
6. 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(i)
Board use the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-6 for the following reasons.

i. Using the ambient receiving water hardness values shown in Table F-6 will result in criteria and effluent limitations that ensure protection of beneficial uses under all ambient receiving water conditions.

ii. The Water Code mandates that the Central Valley Water Board establish permit terms that will ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses. In this case, using the lowest measured ambient hardness to calculate effluent limitations is not required to protect beneficial uses. Calculating effluent limitations based on the lowest measured ambient hardness is not required by the CTR or SIP, and is not reasonable as it would result in overly conservative limits that will impart substantial costs to the Discharger and ratepayers without providing any additional protection of beneficial uses. In compliance with applicable state and federal regulatory requirements, after considering the entire range of ambient hardness values, Board staff has used the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-6 to calculate the proposed effluent limitations for hardness-dependent metals. The proposed effluent limitations are protective of beneficial uses under all flow conditions.

iii. Using an ambient hardness that is higher than the minimum of 34 mg/L will result in limits that may allow increased metals to be discharged to the river, but such discharge is allowed under the State Anti-Degradation Policy. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this degradation is consistent with the antidegradation policy (see antidegradation findings in Section IV.D.4 of the Fact Sheet). The Antidegradation policy requires the Discharger to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that: a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur, and b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.

iv. Using the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-6 is consistent with the CTR and SIP’s requirements for developing metals criteria.
Table F-6. Summary of CTR Criteria for Hardness-dependent Metals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR Metals</th>
<th>Ambient Hardness (mg/L)</th>
<th>CTR Criteria (μg/L, total recoverable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromium III</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>56 (acute) 68 (chronic)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>56^4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>68^4</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>42^5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>68^5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Metal criteria rounded to two significant figures in accordance with the CTR (40 C.F.R. §131.38(b)(2)).
2 The ambient hardness values in this table represent actual observed receiving water hardness measurements from the dataset shown in Figure F-1.
3 The CTR’s hardness dependent metals criteria equations vary differently depending on the metal, which results in differences in the range of ambient hardness values that may be used to develop effluent limitations that are protective of beneficial uses and comply with CTR criteria for all ambient flow conditions.
4 Collected 11 March 2015.
5 Collected 6 December 2013.
6 Collected 7 January 2015.

Background

The State Water Board provided direction regarding the selection of hardness in two precedential water quality orders; WQO 2008-0008 for the City of Davis Wastewater Treatment Plant (Davis Order) and WQO 2004-0013 for the Yuba City Wastewater Treatment Plant (Yuba City Order). The State Water Board recognized that the SIP and the CTR do not discuss the manner in which hardness is to be ascertained, thus regional water boards have considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness so long as the selected value is protective of water quality criteria under the given flow conditions. (Davis Order, p.10). The State Water Board explained that it is necessary that, “The [hardness] value selected should provide protection for all times of discharge under varying hardness conditions.” (Yuba City Order, p. 8). The Davis Order also provides that, “Regardless of the hardness used, the resulting limits must always be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions.” (Davis Order, p. 11)

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

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

Where:

\( H \) = ambient hardness (as CaCO₃) ¹

WER = water-effect ratio

\( m, b \) = metal- and criterion-specific constants

¹ For this discussion, all hardness values are expressed in mg/L as CaCO₃.
The direction in the CTR regarding hardness selection is that it must be based on ambient hardness and consistent with design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones. Consistent with design discharge conditions and design flows means that the selected “design” hardness must result in effluent limitations under design discharge conditions that do not result in more than one exceedance of the applicable criteria in a three year period.\footnote{40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4, notes 1 and 2} Where design flows for aquatic life criteria include the lowest one-day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (1Q10) and the lowest average seven consecutive day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (7Q10). The 1Q10 and 7Q10 Deer Creek flows are 0 cfs and 0.12 cfs, respectively.

**Ambient conditions**

The ambient receiving water hardness varied from 16 mg/L to 142 mg/L, based on 75 upstream and downstream receiving water samples from June 2013 through May 2016 (see Figure F-1).

**Figure F-1. Observed Ambient Hardness Concentrations June 2013 - May 2016**

![Deer Creek Ambient Hardness](image)

In this analysis, the entire range of ambient hardness concentrations shown in Figure F-1 were considered to determine the appropriate ambient hardness to calculate the CTR criteria and effluent limitations that are protective under all discharge conditions.

**Approach to derivation of criteria**

As shown above, ambient hardness varies substantially. Because of the variation, there is no single hardness value that describes the ambient receiving water for all possible scenarios (e.g., minimum, maximum, mid-point). While the hardness selected must be hardness of the ambient receiving water, selection of an ambient receiving water hardness that is too high would result in effluent limitations that do not protect beneficial uses. Also, the use of minimum ambient hardness would result in criteria that are protective of beneficial uses, but such criteria may not be representative considering the wide range of ambient conditions.
**Reasonable worst-case ambient conditions.** To determine whether a selected ambient hardness value results in effluent limitations that are fully protective while complying with federal regulations and state policy, staff have conducted an analysis considering varying ambient hardness and flow conditions. To do this, the Central Valley Water Board has ensured that the receiving water hardness and criteria selected for effluent limitations are protective under “reasonable-worst case ambient conditions.” These conditions represent the receiving water conditions under which derived effluent limitations would ensure protection of beneficial uses under all ambient flow and hardness conditions.

Reasonable worst-case ambient conditions:

- “Low receiving water flow.” CTR design discharge conditions (1Q10 and 7Q10) have been selected to represent reasonable worst case receiving water flow conditions.

- “High receiving water flow (maximum receiving water flow).” This additional flow condition has been selected consistent with the Davis Order, which required that the hardness selected be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions.

- “Low receiving water hardness.” The minimum receiving water hardness condition of 16 mg/L was selected to represent the reasonable worst case receiving water hardness.

- “Background ambient metal concentration at criteria.” This condition assumes that the metal concentration in the background receiving water is equal to CTR criteria (upstream of the facility’s discharge). Based on data in the record, this is a design condition that has not occurred in the receiving water and is used in this analysis to ensure that limits are protective of beneficial uses even in the situation where there is no assimilative capacity.

**Iterative approach.** An iterative analysis has been used to select the ambient hardness to calculate the criteria that will result in effluent limitations that protect beneficial uses under all flow conditions.

The iterative approach is summarized in the following algorithm and described below in more detail.
1. **CRITERIA CALCULATION.** CTR criteria are calculated using the CTR equations based on actual measured ambient hardness sample results, starting with the maximum observed ambient hardness of 142 mg/L. Effluent metal concentrations necessary to meet the above calculated CTR criteria in the receiving water are calculated in accordance with the SIP.\(^1\) This should not be confused with an effluent limit. Rather, it is the Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA), which is synonymous with the wasteload allocation defined by USEPA as “a definition of effluent water quality that is necessary to meet the water quality standards in the receiving water.”\(^2\) If effluent limits are found to be needed, the limits are calculated to enforce the ECA considering effluent variability and the probability basis of the limit.

2. **CHECK.** USEPA’s simple mass balance equation\(^3\) is used to evaluate if discharge at the computed ECA is protective. Resultant downstream metal concentrations are compared with downstream calculated CTR criteria under reasonable worst-case ambient conditions.

3. **ADAPT.** If step 2 results in:

   (A) receiving water metal concentration that complies with CTR criteria under reasonable worst-case ambient conditions, then the hardness value is selected.

   (B) receiving water metal concentration greater than CTR criteria, then return to step 1, selecting a lower ambient hardness value.

---

\(^1\) SIP Section 1.4.B, Step 2, provides direction for calculating the Effluent Concentration Allowance.


\(^3\) U.S. EPA NPDES Permit Writers’ Handbook (EPA 833-K-10-001 September 2010, pg. 6-24)
The CTR’s hardness dependent metals criteria equations contain metal-specific constants, so the criteria vary depending on the metal. Therefore, steps 1 through 3 must be repeated separately for each metal until ambient hardness values are determined that will result in criteria and effluent limitations that comply with the CTR and protect beneficial uses for all metals.

**Results of iterative analysis**
The above iterative analysis for each CTR hardness-dependent metal results in the selected ambient hardness values shown in Table F-6, above. Using these hardness values to calculate criteria, which are actual sample results collected in the receiving water, will result in effluent limitations that are protective under all ambient flow conditions. Copper and silver are used as examples below to illustrate the results of the analysis. Tables F-7 and F-8 below summarize the numeric results of the three step iterative approach for copper and silver. As shown in the example tables, ambient hardness values of 68 mg/L (copper) and 42 mg/L (silver) are used in the CTR equations to derive criteria and effluent limitations. Then under the “check” step, worst-case ambient receiving water conditions are used to test whether discharge results in compliance with CTR criteria and protection of beneficial uses.

The results of the above analysis, summarized in the tables below, show that the ambient hardness values selected using the three-step iterative process results in protective effluent limitations that achieve CTR criteria under all flow conditions. Tables F-7 and F-8 below, summarize the critical flow conditions. However, the analysis evaluated all flow conditions to ensure compliance with the CTR criteria at all times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table F-7. Verification of CTR Compliance for Copper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Copper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Q10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max receiving water flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

2 The ECA defines effluent quality necessary to meet the CTR criteria in the receiving water. There is no effluent limitation for copper as it demonstrates no reasonable potential.
Table F-8. Verification of CTR Compliance for Silver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations</th>
<th>42 mg/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Silver</td>
<td>0.91 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions</td>
<td>Complies with CTR Criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness</td>
<td>CTR Criteria (µg/L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q10</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Q10</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max receiving water flow</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

² The ECA defines effluent quality necessary to meet the CTR criteria in the receiving water. There is no effluent limitation for silver as it demonstrates no reasonable potential.

3. Determining the Need for WQBEL’s

   a. Constituents with No Reasonable Potential. Central Valley Water Board staff conducted reasonable potential analyses for nearly 200 constituents, including the 126 USEPA priority toxic pollutants. All reasonable potential analyses are included in the administrative record and a summary of the constituents of concern is provided in Attachment G. WQBEL’s are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream excursion of an applicable water quality objective; 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. Lead

      (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 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.

      Based on four samples collected between June 2013 and May 2016, lead was detected in the upstream receiving water at a maximum concentration of 0.32 µg/L. Using the minimum reported receiving water hardness of 16 mg/L results in CTR chronic criteria of 0.31 µg/L.
The MEC was 0.25 µg/L based on 15 samples collected between June 2013 and May 2016. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness of 56 mg/L to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum effluent concentration.

The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.

**Table F-9. Lead CTR Criteria Comparison**

<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>0.57 µg/L&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.32 µg/L</td>
<td>No&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>1.52 µg/L&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.25 µg/L</td>
<td>No&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on paired upstream hardness of 26 mg/L (as CaCO₃)
2 Based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness of 56 mg/L (as CaCO₃)
3 Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.
4 Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.

Based on the available data, lead in the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life in the receiving water, and therefore, effluent limitations for lead are not retained in this Order.

### ii. 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.
Table F-10. 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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC (µmhos/cm) or TDS (mg/L)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>EC: 900, 1600, 2200 or TDS: 500, 1000, 1500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EC: 339 or TDS: 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate (mg/L)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>250, 500, 600</td>
<td>N/A</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>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

3 Maximum calendar annual average.

(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. Order R5-2012-0033 included an effluent limitation for electrical conductivity of the municipal water supply plus 500 µmhos/cm or 700 µmhos/cm, whichever is less.

(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.

(b) **RPA Results.**

(1) **Chloride.** Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 35 mg/L to 56 mg/L, with an average of 47 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in Deer Creek ranged from 2.6 mg/L to 3.9 mg/L, with an average of 3.2 mg/L, for four samples collected by the Discharger from March 2015 through December 2015.

(2) **Electrical Conductivity or Total Dissolved Solids.** A review of the Discharger’s monitoring reports shows an average effluent EC of 359 µmhos/cm, with a range from 193 µmhos/cm to 533 µmhos/cm. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The background receiving water EC averaged 55 µmhos/cm. The average TDS effluent concentration was 247 mg/L with concentrations ranging from 82 mg/L to 318 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The background receiving water TDS ranged from 10 mg/L to 66 mg/L, with an average of 32 mg/L.

(3) **Sulfate.** Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 1.8 mg/L to 27 mg/L, with an average of 18 mg/L. These levels do not exceed...
the Secondary MCL. The Deer Creek ranged from 1.6 mg/L to 28 mg/L, with an average of 9.8 mg/L.

Previous Order R5-2012-0033 contained a performance-based limitation effluent limitation for EC as follows:

The annual average effluent electrical conductivity shall not exceed the municipal water supply electrical conductivity plus an increment of 500 µmhos/cm, or 700 µmhos/cm, whichever is less.

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 and this Order does not contain effluent limitations for salinity. Based on new information in the monitoring data, removal of the effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

However, since the Discharger discharges to Deer Creek, a tributary of Yuba 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, this Order contains a provision that the salinity evaluation and minimization plan shall be reviewed and updated if the effluent annual average calendar year electrical conductivity concentration is greater than 700 µmhos/cm. If the plan is updated, it shall be submitted by 1 April following the calendar year in which the effluent electrical conductivity annual average of 700 µmhos/cm was exceeded.

In addition water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the relative contribution of salinity from the source water to the effluent.

b. Constituents with No Data or Insufficient 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. Mercury

(a) WQO. The current NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life, continuous concentration, for mercury is 770 ng/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 50 ng/L for waters from which both water and aquatic organisms are consumed. Both values are controversial and subject to change. In 40 C.F.R. 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 maximum observed effluent mercury concentration of 499 ng/L occurred on 23 June 2015 while the maximum upstream receiving water concentration of 27 ng/L occurred on 15 December 2015. The next highest value for effluent mercury of 460 ng/L occurred on 5 February 2014. The values of 499 ng/L and 460 ng/L are an order of magnitude above the human health criterion of 50 ng/L. The primary laboratory, Diamond Water Laboratory, contracted with Caltest Analytical Laboratory to perform the 5 February 2014 and Basic Laboratory to perform 23 June 2015 sample analysis. After reviewing the chain of custody (COC) for both samples several issues were noted. Neither COC indicated the samples were preserved, which with low level mercury analysis (EPA Method 1631E) the samples must be analyzed within the 48 hour hold time. Neither sample was run within the Method hold time for an unpreserved sample, the 5 February 2014 was analyzed on 27 February 2014, 22 days after collection and the 23 June 2015 samples was analyzed 27 June 2015, 4 days after collection. Also, both COCs did not indicate that the individual doing the sampling on the “Sampled by” line but “Client” was written in on the “Sampled by” line, which does not specify that a properly trained individual performed clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in 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) per the previous Order R5-2012-0033. Neither COC indicates that the samples were relinquished to the laboratory; the 5 February 2014 sample was relinquished to the United Parcel Service (UPS) on 9 February 2014, which leaves 4 days unaccounted for between sampling and delivery to UPS. The 23 June 2015 sample doesn’t indicate when the sample was relinquished to the laboratory, as the signature lines to relinquish and receive the sample are blank.

Separately, influent flow data for 5 February 2014 and 23 June 2015 is 0.41 MGD and 0.32 MGD, respectively, and confirms that the unusually high analytical results were not the product of inflow or infiltration. The Discharger also indicated the Facility had no noted disruptions in operation on the sample dates or days leading up to the sampling events. There are no known significant industrial users connected to Nevada City’s collection system that could be contributing significant amounts of mercury to the discharge. Furthermore, over the past 7 years of effluent monitoring at the Facility indicates that the typical range of mercury concentrations are between 1.2 and 3.6 ng/L, significantly less than the two samples in question (see Table F-11 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mercury (ng/L)</th>
<th>Methylmercury (ng/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2008</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 February 2010</td>
<td>&lt; 0.2</td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 February 2010</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 August 2011</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December 2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January 2013</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 2013</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mercury (ng/L)</th>
<th>Methylmercury (ng/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 September 2013</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 October 2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 February 2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>460</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June 2014</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 September 2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 March 2015</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23 June 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>499</strong></td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 September 2015</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 December 2015</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Not sampled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum receiving water concentration of 27 ng/L is below 50 ng/L; therefore, the receiving water does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the CTR criteria.

SIP section 1.2 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. Based on the weight of evidence discussed above, the values of 499 ng/L and 460 ng/L were considered inappropriate for use in the RPA by the Central Valley Water Board.

Section 1.3, Step 8 of the SIP allows the Central Valley Water Board to require additional monitoring for a pollutant in place of an effluent limitation if data are unavailable or insufficient. Instead of limitations, additional monitoring has been established for mercury and methylmercury in both the effluent and the receiving water. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

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, dichlorobromomethane, pH, total coliform organisms, total residual chlorine, and TSS. WQBEL’s 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 1999 USEPA National Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total ammonia (the “1999 Criteria”), recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based on pH and temperature. USEPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. USEPA found that as pH increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia increased. Salmonids were more sensitive to acute toxicity effects than other species. However, while the acute toxicity of ammonia was not influenced by temperature, it was found that invertebrates and young fish experienced increasing chronic toxicity effects with increasing...
temperature.

The USEPA recently published national recommended water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life from the toxic effects of ammonia in freshwater (the “2013 Criteria”)\(^1\). The 2013 Criteria is an update to USEPA’s 1999 Criteria, and varies based on pH and temperature. Although the 2013 Criteria reflects the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia to certain freshwater aquatic life, including new toxicity data on sensitive freshwater mussels in the Family Unionidae, the species tested for development of the 2013 Criteria may not be present in some Central Valley waterways. The 2013 Criteria document therefore states that, “unionid mussel species are not prevalent in some waters, such as the arid west …” and provides that, “In the case of ammonia, where a state demonstrates that mussels are not present on a site-specific basis, the recalculation procedure may be used to remove the mussel species from the national criteria dataset to better represent the species present at the site.”\(^2\)

The Central Valley Water Board issued a 3 April 2014 California Water Code Section 13267 Order for Information: 2013 Final Ammonia Criteria for Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life (13267 Order) requiring the Discharger to either participate in an individual or group study to determine the presence of mussels or submit a method of compliance for complying with effluent limitations calculated assuming mussels present using the 2013 Criteria. On 31 March 2015, the Discharger submitted the following report: Literature Review Regarding the Current and/or Historic Distribution of Freshwater Mussels Relative to the City of Nevada City which evaluated the probability of ammonia-sensitive unionid mussels being present in Deer Creek, in the vicinity of the Facility. The report concluded that although there are no records of freshwater mussels in the Deer Creek watershed, there is a potential presence of host fish near the Facility and generally suitable habitat conditions near the Facility. The potential presence of mussels downstream of the Facility cannot be ruled out.

Studies are currently underway to determine how the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia reflected in the 2013 Criteria can be implemented in the Central Valley Region as part of a Basin Planning effort to adopt nutrient and ammonia objectives. Until the Basin Planning process is completed, the Central Valley Water Board will continue to implement the 1999 Criteria to interpret the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

Because the Deer Creek has a beneficial use of cold freshwater habitat and the presence of salmonids and early fish life stages in the Deer Creek is well-documented, the recommended 1999 criteria for waters where salmonids and early life stages are present were used.

---

\(^1\) Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Freshwater, published August 2013 [EPA 822-R-13-001]
The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.0. 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 8.0 has been established for discharge from the Facility as discussed in section IV.C.3.b.iv of this Fact Sheet. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an organism, a pH value of 8.0 was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion is 5.62 mg/L.

A chronic criterion was calculated using the rolling 30-day average pH and temperature of the effluent for each day when paired temperature and pH were measured. The minimum observed 30-day average criteria was established as the applicable 30-day average chronic criterion, or 30-day CCC. The maximum observed 30-day average effluent temperature was 73°F (23°C), for the rolling 30-day period ending September 2014. The corresponding 30-day average effluent pH was 7.4. Using a pH value of 7.4 and the worst-case temperature value of 73°F (23°C) on a rolling 30-day basis, the resulting 30-day CCC is 2.81 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 2.81 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 7.03 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, “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. 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, “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 WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s 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.” With regard to POTW’s, USEPA recommends that, “POTW's 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 WQBEL’s are required.

(c) **WQBEL’s.** The Central Valley Water Board calculates WQBEL’s 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 average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL). The remainder of the WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures.

This Order will retain final AMEL and AWEL for ammonia from Order R5-2012-0033 of 1.9 mg/L and 4.2 mg/L, respectively, based on the protection of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective using the 1999 ammonia criteria, due to the less stringent nature of limits calculated using data from June 2013 to May 2016.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 1.7 mg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL’s. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, 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 WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s 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.” With regard to POTW’s, USEPA recommends that, “POTW’s should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.” (TSD, p. 50)

The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. Although the Discharger uses a sulfur dioxide process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to Deer Creek, the existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC.
(c) **WQBEL’s.** The USEPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control* [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-hour) aquatic life criteria to average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations based on the variability of the existing data and the expected frequency of monitoring. However, because chlorine is an acutely toxic constituent that can and will be monitored continuously, an average 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively, based on USEPA’s NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that effluent concentrations of chlorine residual are consistently less than the applicable WQBEL’s. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iii. **Dichlorobromomethane**

(a) **WQO.** The CTR includes criterion of 0.56 µg/L for dichlorobromomethane for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.

(b) **RPA.** The MEC for dichlorobromomethane was 3.9 µg/L while the maximum observed upstream receiving water concentration was non-detect with a method detection limit of 0.09 µg/L. Therefore, dichlorobromomethane has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.

(c) **WQBELs.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane; therefore, as discussed further in Section IV.C.2.c. of this Fact Sheet, a dilution credit of 7.28:1 may be allowed in the development of the WQBEL’s for dichlorobromomethane. Based on the allowable dilution credit, this Order contains a final AMEL of 4.3 µg/L and MDEL of 11 µg/L.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 3.9 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL’s. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iv. **Nitrate and Nitrite**

(a) **WQO.** DDW 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. DDW 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).
(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 WQBEL’s are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 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. 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, “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 WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s 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.” With regard to POTW’s, USEPA recommends that, “POTW’s 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 nitite 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 WQBEL’s are required.

(c) **WQBEL’s.** This Order contains an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL) for nitrate plus nitrite of 10 µg/L and 17 µg/L, respectively, based on the Basin Plan’s narrative chemical constituents objective for protection of the MUN beneficial use. These effluent limitations are included in this Order to assure the treatment process adequately nitrifies and denitrifies the waste stream to protect the beneficial use of municipal and domestic supply.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 5.5 mg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL’s. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

v. **Pathogens**

(a) **WQO.** DDW 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 DDW’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 WQBEL’s 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. 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, “**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 WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s 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, p. 50)

The beneficial uses of Deer Creek include municipal and domestic supply, water contact recreation, and agricultural irrigation supply, and there is, at times, less than 20:1 dilution. To protect these beneficial uses, the 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 WQBEL’s are required.

(c) **WQBEL’s.** 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 DDW 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 BOD₅, 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 WQBEL’s for BOD₅ and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. BOD₅ is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The tertiary treatment standards for BOD₅ and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the tertiary treatment process. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD₅ 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 BOD₅ and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed. Therefore, this Order requires AMEL’s for BOD₅ 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 BOD₅ and TSS is included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Facility includes tertiary treatment facilities that enable the Discharger to comply with the WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

vi. **pH**

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

(b) **RPA Results.** 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 WQBEL’s 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 WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s 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, p. 50)

The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Based on 1,278 samples taken from June 2013 to May 2016, the maximum pH reported was 7.8 and the minimum was 5.5. The Facility did not exceed the instantaneous maximum effluent limitation of 8.0. Although the Discharger has proper pH controls in place, the pH for the Facility’s influent varies due to the nature of municipal sewage, which provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan’s numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, WQBEL’s for pH are required in this Order.

(c) **WQBEL’s.** Effluent limitations for pH of 6.5 as an instantaneous minimum and 8.0 as an instantaneous maximum are included in this Order. 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 effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2012-0033 have been retained in this Order.

(d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of 1,278 pH samples taken from June 2013 to May 2016, shows that the pH of the effluent is consistently between the pH values of 6.5 and 8.0 with a maximum of 7.8
and an average of 7.0. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that immediate compliance with the effluent limitations for pH is feasible.

4. **WQBEL Calculations**

   a. This Order includes WQBEL’s for ammonia, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, pH, total coliform organisms, and total residual chlorine. The general methodology for calculating WQBEL’s based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.5.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:

   \[
   ECA = C + D(C - B) \quad \text{where } C > B, \text{ and } \\
   ECA = C \quad \text{where } C \leq B
   \]

   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 WQBEL’s 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.** WQBEL’s 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. \( LTA_{\text{acute}} \) and \( LTA_{\text{chronic}} \)) using statistical multipliers and the lowest \( LTA \) is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.

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

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

\[
MDEL = \text{mult}_{MDEL} \left[ \min \left( M_A ECA_{\text{acute}}, M_C ECA_{\text{chronic}} \right) \right] \quad \text{LTA}_{\text{chronic}}
\]
\[ MDEL_{HH} = \left( \frac{\text{mult}_{MDEL}}{\text{mult}_{AMEL}} \right) AMEL_{HH} \]

where:
\[ \text{mult}_{AMEL} = \text{statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL} \]
\[ \text{mult}_{MDEL} = \text{statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL} \]
\[ M_A = \text{statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to LTA}_{\text{acute}} \]
\[ M_C = \text{statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to LTA}_{\text{chronic}} \]

Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point No. 001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Monthly</td>
<td>Average Weekly</td>
<td>Maximum Daily</td>
<td>Instantaneous Minimum</td>
<td>Instantaneous Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrite</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coliform Organisms</td>
<td>MPN/100 mL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.2^2</td>
<td>23^3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residual Chlorine</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.011^4</td>
<td>0.019^5</td>
<td>--</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>2.3^6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.6^8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on Facility design flow of 0.69 MGD.
2 Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.
3 Not to be exceeded more than once in 30 days.
4 Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.
5 Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.
6 Based on CTR multiplied by the dilution credit of 7.28:1.

5. **Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)**

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

a. **Acute Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at 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 WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s 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 acutely toxic 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 the table below, based on chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger from June 2013 through May 2016, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.
Table F-13. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Fathead Minnow</th>
<th>Water Flea</th>
<th>Green Algae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survival (TUC)</td>
<td>Growth (TUC)</td>
<td>Survival (TUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires annual chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, the Special Provision in section VI.C.2.a of the Order 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.

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 numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE workplan or an approved Toxicity Evaluation Study. 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 C.F.R section 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 C.F.R. section 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 CF.R. section 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 MCL’s) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the design flow (Average Dry Weather Flow) permitted in section IV.A.1.f of this Order.
2. **Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations**

40 C.F.R. section 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for POTW's unless impracticable. For BOD₅, chlorine residual, dichlorobromomethane, pH, and TSS, weekly average effluent limitations have been replaced or supplemented with effluent limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. For dichlorobromomethane, this Order includes AMEL’s and MDEL’s as required by the SIP. 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 CWA specifies that a revised permit may not include effluent limitations that are less stringent than the previous permit unless a less stringent limitation is justified based on exceptions to the anti-backsliding provisions contained in CWA sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l).

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the Order R5-2012-0033, with the exception of effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane, lead, and salinity. The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in order R5-2012-0033. 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 water quality-based effluent limits “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 TMDL’s 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.

Deer Creek is considered an attainment water for dichlorobromomethane, lead, and salinity because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for this constituent.¹ As discussed in section IV.D.4, below, relaxation of the effluent limits complies with federal and state antidegradation requirements. Thus, removal of the effluent limitations for lead and salinity and relaxation of effluent limits for dichlorobromomethane from Order R5-2012-0033 meets the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

   b. **CWA section 402(o)(2).** CWA section 402(o)(2) also 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

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.
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 R5-2012-0033 was issued indicates that electrical conductivity and lead do not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in the receiving water. Additionally, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2012-0033 was issued indicates that less stringent effluent limitations for dichlorbromomethane based on available dilution credits satisfy requirements in CWA section 402(o)(2). The updated information that supports the relaxation of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

i. **Dichlorobromomethane.** Order R5-2012-0033 established a performance based MDEL for dichlorobromomethane based on a dilution credit of 4.1:1 because the entire dilution credit of 7.28:1 was not needed for compliance based on monitoring data available at the time. However, effluent and receiving water monitoring data collected between June 2013 and May 2016 indicates that the maximum concentrations of dichlorobromomethane would exceed the MDEL in Order R5-2012-0033. This Order relaxes the effluent limitations for dichlorbromoethane from Order R5-2012-0033 based on the updated information.

ii. **Lead.** Effluent and receiving water monitoring data collected between June 2013 and May 2016 indicates that lead in the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contributed to an exceedance of the CTR criterion for the protection of aquatic life.

iii. **Salinity.** The previous permit WDR Order R5-2012-0033 contained effluent limitations for electrical conductivity based on data available in 2012. A review of the Discharger’s monitoring reports from June 2013 to May 2016 shows an average effluent EC of 339 µmhos/cm, with a range from 193 µmhos/cm to 533 µmhos/cm. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity and this Order does not contain effluent limitations for salinity. Thus, removal of the effluent limitations for EC from Order R5-2017-0060 meets the exception in CWA section CWA 402(o)(2)(B)(i) and complies with the Antidegradation Policies.

4. **Antidegradation Policies**

The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. This Order provides for an increase in the volume and mass of pollutants discharged for dichlorbromomethane. The increase will not have significant impacts on beneficial uses and will not cause violation of water quality objectives. The increase in the discharge allows wastewater utility service necessary to accommodate housing and economic expansion in the area, and is considered to be a benefit to the people of the State. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of BPTC of the discharge.

This Order removes effluent limitations for lead and electrical conductivity based on updated monitoring data demonstrating that the effluent does not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality criteria or objectives in the receiving water. The removal of WQBEL’s for these parameters will not result in an increase in pollutant concentration or loading, a decrease in the level of treatment or control, or a reduction of
water quality. Thus, the removal of effluent limitations for these constituents in consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Anti-Degradation Policy.

This Order relaxes the effluent limitation for dichlorobromomethane. The revised effluent limitation is based on effluent and receiving monitoring data between June 2013 and May 2016. A complete antidegradation analysis, *Anti-Degradation Analysis Related to Revising the Effluent Limitation for Carbon Tetrachloride and Dichlorobromomethane Based on the Results of a Mixing Zone and Dilution Study for Carcinogens*, was submitted by the Discharger in May 2011. The relaxed effluent limitation for dichlorobromomethane is within the available assimilative capacity of Deer Creek and will not adversely impact the in-stream beneficial uses of Deer Creek. Comparison of environmental and socioeconomic impacts of liquid chlorine disinfection with alternatives (pre-ozonation and UV disinfection) shows that liquid chlorine disinfection provides the best practicable treatment or control consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the States. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the increased loading of dichlorobromomethane is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Anti-Degradation Policy.

5. **Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants**

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBEL’s for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD\textsubscript{5}, TSS, and pH. Restrictions on flow, BOD\textsubscript{5}, TSS, and pH are discussed in section IV.B of the Fact Sheet. This Order’s technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements.

WQBEL’s 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 WQBEL’s 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 water quality-based effluent limitations for priority pollutants are based on the CTR implemented by the SIP, which was approved by U.S. EPA on 18 May, 2000. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by U.S. EPA prior to 30 May, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to U.S. EPA prior to 30 May, 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).
### Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

#### Discharge Point 001

#### Table F-14. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>0.69(^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></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(^3)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</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(^3)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>4.3(^4)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Conventional Pollutants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Toxicity</td>
<td>% Survival</td>
<td>70(^6)/90(^7)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day(^3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrite</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Coliform Organisms</strong></td>
<td>MPN/100 mL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.2(^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residual Chlorine</strong></td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.011(^10)</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.
3. CFR – Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 CFR part 133.
4. BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.
5. PP – Based on treatment plant performance.
6. CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.
7. NAWQC – Based on USEPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
8. MCL – Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.
9. Title 22 – Based on CA Department of Public Health Reclamation Criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22).
10. The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 0.69 MGD. 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 (i.e., July, August, and September).
11. Based on a design flow of 0.69 MGD.

**E. Land DischargeSpecifications – Not Applicable**
F. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

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 “the 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.

B. Groundwater

1. The wastewater and biosolid processes at the Facility are contained within piping, concrete structures, and tanks, and consequently there is no existing threat to groundwater. Therefore, groundwater limitations are not necessary to protect groundwater and are not included within this Order.

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. Additionally, if all the mercury data collected during the previous permit term is determined to be valid or future mercury analytical results are above the human health criterion, then this Order may be reopened to include mercury effluent limitations based on the data.
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. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The Tentative Order includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of >1TUc that requires the initiation of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation or Toxicity Evaluation Study if exceeded. If the Discharger demonstrates that the monitoring trigger should be revised, this order may be reopened to adjust the toxicity monitoring trigger.

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 June 2013 through May 2016, 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, or the Discharger may choose to participate in or conduct an approved TES instead.

   **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-2), 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:
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Figure F-2
WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart
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Toxicity Evaluation Study. The Facility serves a population of approximately 3,150 and provides tertiary level treatment of the municipal wastewater disinfected by chlorine treatment. Sources of wastewater are mainly domestic sources within the Discharger’s service area. The discharge is a high-quality effluent and did not demonstrate that chronic toxicity was present in the discharge during the previous permit term. This provision allows the Discharger to conduct an approved Toxicity Evaluation Study to investigate the cause of toxicity if it occurs at a future date, individually or as part of a coordinated group effort with other dischargers.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention
      i. The Discharger shall continue to implement the existing salinity evaluation and minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the Facility. The Discharger shall provide annual reports discussing the effectiveness of implementing the salinity evaluation and minimization plan. Discussion of the plan effectiveness shall include the following:
         (a) A description of the measures that have been implemented to address salinity in the discharge;
         (b) An assessment of the effectiveness of the implemented measures; and
         (c) The cost of implementing those measures.
         The annual reports shall be submitted in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1).
      ii. The salinity evaluation and minimization plan shall be reviewed and updated if the effluent annual average calendar year electrical conductivity concentration is greater than 700 µmhos/cm. If the plan must be updated, it shall be submitted by 1 April following the calendar year in which the effluent electrical conductivity annual average of 700 µmhos/cm was exceeded.

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. 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.

5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)
   a. Collection System. 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 State Water Board amended the Monitoring and Reporting Program for the General Order through Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC on 6 August 2013. 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.

The General Order contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows that are more extensive, and therefore, more stringent than the requirements under federal standard provisions. The Discharger and public agencies that are discharging wastewater into the facility's collection system were required to obtain enrollment for regulation under the General Order by 1 December 2006.

b. **Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications.** Sludge in this Order 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 sludge 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 C.F.R. part 503. This provision includes specifications to ensure sludge/biosolids are properly handled onsite to prevent nuisance, protect public health, and protect groundwater quality. This Order does not regulate offsite use or disposal of biosolids since these activities are regulated under 40 C.F.R. part 503; which is a program administered by U.S. EPA.

6. **Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable**

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

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping 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, pH, BOD5, electrical conductivity, and TSS have been retained from Order No. R5-2012-0033.

B. **Effluent Monitoring**

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 C.F.R. section 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, BOD5, TSS, pH, ammonia, total coliform organisms, electrical conductivity, total residual chlorine, total dissolved solids, and dichlorodibromomethane have been retained from Order R5-2012-0033 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters.
3. Monitoring data collected over the previous permit term for lead, standard minerals, and trihalomethanes did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order No. R5-2012-0033.

4. Deer Creek is listed on the 2010 303(d) list of impaired water bodies for mercury. Order R5-2012-0033 required eight quarters of effluent monitoring for mercury and methylmercury in order to gather data if a performance-based mass limit was established. Monitoring data collected from June 2013 to May 2016 was inconclusive due to analytical results that were inconsistent with historical and current data. Section 1.3, Step 8 of the SIP allows the Central Valley Water Board to require additional monitoring for a pollutant in place of an effluent limitation if data are unavailable or insufficient. Instead of limitations, additional monitoring has been established for mercury and methylmercury in both the effluent and the receiving water. Thus, quarterly effluent monitoring for mercury and methylmercury has been established in this Order.

5. 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 DDW 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 CWA. (Wat. Code §§ 13370, subd. (c), 13372, 13377.) Section 13176 is inapplicable to NPDES permits to the extent it is inconsistent with CWA 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). Due to the location of the Facility, it is both legally and factually impossible for the Discharger to comply with section 13176 for constituents with short holding times.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

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

2. Chronic Toxicity. Annual chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring

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

2. Groundwater – Not Applicable

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Biosolids Monitoring

Biosolids monitoring for compliance with 40 C.F.R. part 503 regulations is not included in this Order since it is a program administered by the U.S. EPA. The webpage below provides information on compliance with U.S. EPA’s part 503 biosolids program:

2. **Water Supply Monitoring**

   Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater. Total dissolved solids monitoring has been discontinued based on low levels.

3. **Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program**

   Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), U.S. EPA requires all dischargers under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by U.S.EPA to the State Water Board, the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from their own laboratories or their contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory’s ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall submit annually the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to the State Water Board. The State Water Board’s Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to U.S. EPA’s DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

**VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Central Valley Water Board has considered the issuance of WDR’s that will serve as an NPDES permit for the City of Nevada City Wastewater Treatment Plant. 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: posting of the Notice of Public Hearing at the entrance to the Facility and City of Nevada City City Hall on 11 May 2017.

   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/board_info/meetings/

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 5 June 2017.
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: 9 June 2017
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 Michelle Snapp at (916) 464-4824 or Michelle.Snapp@waterboards.ca.gov.
## ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

<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>Ammonia (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.100</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>900²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrite</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrite (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>&lt;0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes¹</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
- NA = Not Available
- ND = Non-detect

Footnotes:
1. Based on treatment of domestic wastewater.
2. Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the MCL.
## ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBEL’S

### Human Health WQBEL’s Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mean Background Concentration</th>
<th>Dilution Factor</th>
<th>MDEL/AMEL Multiplier</th>
<th>AMEL Multiplier</th>
<th>AMEL</th>
<th>MDEL</th>
<th>AWEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate plus Nitrogen, Total (as N)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.42²</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Calculated by setting the LTA equal to the Secondary MCL of 200 µg/L and using the AMEL multiplier to set the AMEL. The AWEL was calculated from the AMEL using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier. (Table 2 of the SIP)
2 Maximum background concentration.

### Aquatic Life WQBEL’s Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Dilution Factors</th>
<th>Aquatic Life Calculations</th>
<th>Final Effluent Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>5.62</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Average Monthly Effluent Limitations are calculated according to Section 1.4 of the SIP using a 95th percentile occurrence probability.
2 Average Weekly Effluent Limitations are calculated according to Section 1.4 of the SIP using a 98th percentile occurrence probability.
3 Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations are calculated according to Section 1.4 of the SIP using a 99th percentile occurrence probability.