

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

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

ORDER R5-2019-0018

NPDES NO. CA0081787

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
SPX CORPORATION, SPX MARLEY COOLING TECHNOLOGIES
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY**

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

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	SPX Corporation
Name of Facility	SPX Marley Cooling Technologies
Facility Address	200 North Wagner Avenue
	Stockton, CA 95215
	San Joaquin County

Table 2. Discharge Location

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude (North)	Discharge Point Longitude (West)	Receiving Water
001	Treated groundwater and storm water	37° 58' 19" N	121° 13' 34" W	Stockton Diverting Canal

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was adopted on:	8 February 2019
This Order shall become effective on:	1 April 2019
This Order shall expire on:	31 March 2024
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:	31 March 2023
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:	Minor discharge

I, Patrick Pulupa, 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 **8 February 2019**.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
PATRICK PULUPA, Executive Officer

CONTENTS

I. Facility Information 3
 II. Findings 3
 III. Discharge Prohibitions 4
 IV. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications 4
 A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point EFF-001 4
 1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point EFF-001 4
 2. Interim Effluent Limitations - Not Applicable..... 5
 B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable 5
 C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable..... 5
 V. Receiving Water Limitations 5
 A. Surface Water Limitations 5
 B. Groundwater Limitation – Not Applicable 7
 VI. Provisions 7
 A. Standard Provisions 7
 B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements 10
 C. Special Provisions..... 11
 1. Reopener Provisions 11
 2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements..... 12
 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention 13
 4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications 13
 5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) – Not Applicable 13
 6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable..... 13
 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable 13
 VII. Compliance Determination 14

TABLES

Table 1. Discharger Information 1
 Table 2. Discharge Location 1
 Table 3. Administrative Information..... 1
 Table 4. Effluent Limitations..... 5

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Definitions.....A-1
 Attachment B – MapB-1
 Attachment C – Flow SchematicC-1
 Attachment D – Standard ProvisionsD-1
 Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting ProgramE-1
 Attachment F – Fact SheetF-1
 Attachment G – Summary Of Reasonable Potential Analysis G-1
 Attachment H – Calculation of WQBEL’S.....H-1

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the SPX Marley Cooling Technologies Groundwater Cleanup Site (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 **IV.B, IV.C, and V.B** are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- D. **Monitoring and Reporting.** 40 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 Persons.** 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 R5-2014-0013 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 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.
- B. The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in section 13050 of the Water Code.
- D. Discharge of waste classified as 'hazardous', as defined in the California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 66261.1 et seq., is prohibited.
- E. **Average Daily Flow.** Discharges exceeding an average daily flow of 0.94 million gallons per day (MGD) are prohibited.

IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point EFF-001

1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point EFF-001

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point 001. Unless otherwise specified compliance shall be 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

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Maximum Daily	Annual Average	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Priority Pollutants						
Chromium (VI), Dissolved	µg/L	4.9	16	--	--	--
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	6.6	17	--	--	--
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm		--	1100	--	--

- a. **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.

2. Interim Effluent Limitations - Not Applicable

B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water Limitations

The discharge shall not cause the following in the Stockton Diverting Canal.

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 U.S. EPA 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.

B. Groundwater Limitation – Not Applicable

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 U.S. EPA 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 U.S. EPA 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.

- o. 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.
- p. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, maximum daily effluent limitation, average monthly effluent limitation, annual 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. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and the mass effluent limitation modified (higher or lower) or an effluent concentration limitation imposed. If the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the mercury mass loading limitation(s) and the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- c. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) or Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES), this Order may be reopened to include a new chronic toxicity effluent limitation, a revised acute toxicity effluent limitation, and/or an effluent limitation for a specific toxicant identified in a TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions, this Order may be reopened to implement the new provisions.
- d. **Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for copper. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- 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. **Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS).** On 31 May 2018, as part of the CV-SALTS initiative, the Central Valley Water Board approved Basin Plan Amendments to incorporate new strategies for addressing ongoing salt and nitrate accumulation in the Central Valley. If approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA, the Amendments would impose certain new requirements on salt and nitrate discharges. More information regarding these Amendments can be found at the following link:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/salinity/
If the Amendments ultimately go into effect, this Order may be amended or modified to incorporate any newly-applicable requirements.

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Requirements.** 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 chronic toxicity thresholds defined in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent 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. Alternatively, under certain conditions as described in this provision below, the Discharger may participate in an approved Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES) in lieu of conducting a site-specific TRE.
- i. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is 1 TUc (where $TUc = 100/NOEC$). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to initiate additional actions to evaluate effluent toxicity as specified in subsection ii, below.
- ii. **Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Trigger Exceeded.** When a chronic whole effluent toxicity result during routine monitoring exceeds the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall proceed as follows:
- (a) **Initial Toxicity Check.** If the result is less than or equal to 1.3 TUc (as $100/EC_{25}$) AND/OR the percent effect is less than 25 percent at 100 percent effluent, check for any operation or sample collection issues and return to routine chronic toxicity monitoring. Otherwise, proceed to step (b).
- (b) **Evaluate 6-week Median.** The Discharger may take two additional samples within 6 weeks of the initial routine sampling event exceeding the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger to evaluate compliance using a 6-week median. If the 6-week median is greater than 1.3 TUc (as $100/EC_{25}$) and the percent effect is greater than 25 percent at 100 percent effluent, proceed with subsection (c). Otherwise, the Discharger shall check for any operation or sample collection issues and return to routine chronic toxicity monitoring.
- (c) **Toxicity Source Easily Identified.** 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 resume routine chronic toxicity monitoring; If the source of toxicity is not easily identified the Discharger shall conduct a site-specific TRE or participate in an approved TES as described in the following subsections.
- (d) **Toxicity Evaluation Study.** If the percent effect is ≤ 50 percent at 100 percent effluent, as the median of up to three consecutive chronic toxicity tests within a 6 week period, the Discharger may participate in an approved TES in lieu of a site-specific TRE. The TES may be conducted individually or as part of a coordinated group effort with other similar dischargers. If the Discharger chooses not to participate in an approved TES, a site-specific TRE shall be initiated in accordance with subsection

(e)(1), below. Nevertheless, the Discharger may participate in an approved TES instead of a TRE if the Discharger has conducted a site-specific TRE within the past 12 months and has been unsuccessful in identifying the toxicant.

- (e) **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation.** If the percent effect is > 50 percent at 100 percent effluent, as the median of three consecutive chronic toxicity tests within a 6 week period, the Discharger shall initiate a site-specific TRE as follows:

(1) **Within thirty (30) days** of exceeding the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Central Valley Water Board including, at minimum:

- Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including a TRE WET monitoring schedule;
- Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
- A schedule for these actions.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger submitted a Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan on 1 September 2009. The Discharger shall continue to implement the existing Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan to identify and address sources of salinity discharged from the Facility.

The Discharger shall evaluate the effectiveness of the salinity evaluation and minimization plan and provide a summary with the Report of Waste Discharge, due 1-year prior to the permit expiration date.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Release Prevention/Contingency Measures Plan.** The Discharger submitted a Release Prevention/Contingency Measures Plan on 29 January 2009 in accordance with Order R5-2008-0170. The Discharger shall continue implementation of the Plan. These Plans shall include proposed modifications to the treatment system and describe implementation of additional monitoring and inspections in the event of an accidental discharge or spill.

5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) – Not Applicable

6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

- A. **Average Daily Flow Prohibition (Section III.E).** The average daily discharge flow represents the mean of all daily flow values obtained within a calendar day (i.e., midnight through 11:59 PM).
- B. **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.
- C. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitation (Section V.A.5.a-c).** Monthly receiving water monitoring is required in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) and is sufficient to evaluate the impacts of the discharge and compliance with this Order. Monthly receiving water monitoring data, measured at monitoring locations RSW-001 and RSW-002, will be used to determine compliance with part "c" of the dissolved oxygen receiving water limitation to ensure the discharge does not cause the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the Stockton Diverting Canal to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time. However, should more frequent dissolved oxygen and temperature receiving water monitoring be conducted, Central Valley Water Board staff may evaluate compliance with parts "a" and "b".

A.

ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

Arithmetic Mean (μ)

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

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

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

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

Bioaccumulative

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

Carcinogenic

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

Coefficient of Variation (CV)

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

Daily Discharge

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

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

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

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

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

Dilution Credit

Dilution Credit is the amount of dilution granted to a discharge in the calculation of a water quality-based effluent limitation, based on the allowance of a specified mixing zone. It is calculated from the

dilution ratio or determined through conducting a mixing zone study or modeling of the discharge and receiving water.

Effect Concentration (EC)

A point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause an observable adverse effect (e.g. death, immobilization, or serious incapacitation) in a given percent of the test organisms, calculated from a continuous model (e.g. Probit Model). EC_{25} is a point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause an observable adverse effect in 25 percent of the test organisms.

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.

Endpoint

An effect that is measured in a toxicity study. Endpoints in toxicity tests may include, but are not limited to survival, reproduction, and growth.

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.

Inhibition Concentration

Inhibition Concentration (IC) is a point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause a given percent reduction in a non-lethal biological measurement (e.g., reproduction or growth), calculated from a continuous model (i.e., Interpolation Method). IC_{25} is a point estimate of the toxic concentration that would cause a 25-percent reduction in a non-lethal biological measurement.

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 measured concentration of a substance that can be reported with 99 percent confidence that the measured concentration is distinguishable from method blank results, as defined in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Attachment B.

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.

No-Observed-Effect-Concentration (NOEC)

The highest concentration of toxicant to which organisms are exposed in a full life-cycle or partial life-cycle (short-term) test, that causes no observable adverse effects on the test organisms (i.e., the highest concentration of toxicant in which the values for the observed responses are not statistically significantly different from the controls).

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.

Percent Effect

The percent effect at the instream waste concentration (IWC) shall be calculated using untransformed data and the following equation:

$$\text{Percent Effect of the Sample} = \frac{\text{Mean Control Response} - \text{Mean Sample Response}}{\text{Mean Control Response}} \cdot 100$$

Persistent Pollutants

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

Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

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

Pollution Prevention

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

Satellite Collection System

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

Source of Drinking Water

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

Standard Deviation (σ)

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

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

where:

x is the observed value;

μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and

n is the number of samples.

Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

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

B.

ATTACHMENT B – MAP

Figure B-1. Map depicting the Facility location, the locations of receiving water monitoring points RSW-001 and RSW-002, and discharge point EFF-001.




Figure B-2. Map depicting the Stockton Diverting Canal, Discharge point EFF-001, and upstream receiving water flow monitoring station MRS (USACE).





Figure B-3. Site Plan



C.

ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC

Figure C-1. Overall System Process Flow Diagram




Figure C-2. Electrochemical Precipitation System Flow Diagram




Figure C-3. Ion Exchange System Flow Diagram




Figure C-4. Groundwater Extraction and Equalization Flow Diagram





Figure C-5. Symbols, Instrument Legend, and Definitions



D.

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. The notice shall be sent to the Central Valley Water Board. As of 21 December 2020, all notices shall be submitted electronically to the initial recipient (State Water Board), defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J below. Notices shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)
 - b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit a notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). The notice shall be sent to the Central Valley Water Board. As of 21 December 2020, all notices shall be submitted electronically to the initial recipient (State Water Board), defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J below. Notices shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)

H. Upset

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

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was 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 a responsible corporate officer. For the purpose of this section, a responsible corporate officer means: (i) A president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy- or decision-making functions for the

corporation, or (ii) the manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities, provided, the manager is authorized to make management decisions which govern the operation of the regulated facility including having the explicit or implicit duty of making major capital investment recommendations, and initiating and directing other comprehensive measures to assure long term environmental compliance with environmental laws and regulations; the manager can ensure that the necessary systems are established or actions taken to gather complete and accurate information for permit application requirements; and where authority to sign documents has been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(1).)

3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
 - a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
 - b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
 - c. The written authorization is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)
5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

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

Existing manufacturing, commercial, mining, and silvicultural Dischargers shall notify the Central Valley Water Board as soon as they know or have reason to believe (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)):

1. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in the discharge, on a routine or frequent basis, of any toxic pollutant that is not limited in this Order, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following "notification levels" (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)):
 - a. 100 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(i));
 - b. 200 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for acrolein and acrylonitrile; 500 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for 2,4-dinitrophenol and 2-methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol; and 1 milligram per liter (mg/L) for antimony (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(ii));
 - c. Five (5) times the maximum concentration value reported for that pollutant in the Report of Waste Discharge (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(iii)); or
 - d. The level established by the Central Valley Water Board in accordance with section 122.44(f). (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(iv).)
2. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in the discharge, on a non-routine or infrequent basis, of any toxic pollutant that is not limited in this Order, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following "notification levels" (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)):
 - a. 500 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(i));
 - b. 1 milligram per liter (mg/L) for antimony (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(ii));
 - c. Ten (10) times the maximum concentration value reported for that pollutant in the Report of Waste Discharge (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(iii)); or
 - d. The level established by the Central Valley Water Board in accordance with section 122.44(f). (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(iv).)

E.

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Contents

I. General Monitoring ProvisionsE-2
II. Monitoring LocationsE-3
III. Influent Monitoring Requirements.....E-3
 A. Monitoring Locations INF-001 and INF-002E-3
IV. Effluent Monitoring RequirementsE-4
 A. Monitoring Location EFF-001E-4
V. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing RequirementsE-5
VI. Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not ApplicableE-8
VII. Recycling Monitoring Requirements – Not ApplicableE-8
VIII. Receiving Water Monitoring RequirementsE-8
 A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 and RSW-002E-8
IX. Other Monitoring RequirementsE-9
 A. Effluent and Receiving Water CharacterizationE-9
X. Reporting RequirementsE-14
 A. General Monitoring and Reporting RequirementsE-14
 B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)E-14
 C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's).....E-16
 D. Other ReportsE-16

Tables

Table E-1. Monitoring Station LocationsE-3
Table E-2. Influent MonitoringE-4
Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring.....E-4
Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series.....E-6
Table E-5. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements.....E-8
Table E-6. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization MonitoringE-10
Table E-7. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule.....E-14
Table E-8. Technical Reports.....E-17

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. Final 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 accredited 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 an accredited 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 non-accredited 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 U.S. EPA 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 accredited 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:

State Water Resources Control Board
 Quality Assurance Program Officer
 Office of Information Management and Analysis
 1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

- 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

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	A location where a representative sample of the influent to the ion-exchange system can be collected prior to any treatment processes.
--	INF-002	A location where a representative sample of the influent to the electrochemical and precipitation system can be collected prior to any treatment processes
001	EFF-001	A location representative of the final effluent from the treated groundwater (Latitude 37°58'20.8" N, Longitude: 121°13'40.1" W)
--	RSW-001	Approximately 7500 feet upstream from the point of discharge at the Main Street Bridge station (Latitude: 37°57'41" N, Longitude:121°12'18.7" W)
--	RSW-002	Approximately 1450 feet downstream from the point of discharge at the Fremont Street Bridge station (Latitude: 37°58'27", Longitude: 121°13'52.7" W)

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

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Locations INF-001 and INF-002

- 1. The Discharger shall monitor the influent to the ion exchange system and the influent to the electrochemical and precipitation system at INF-001 and INF-002 as follows:

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency ³	Required Analytical Test Method
Arsenic, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab ²	1/Quarter	1
Chromium (total), Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab ²	1/Quarter	1
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab ²	1/Quarter	1
Electrical Conductivity @25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab ²	1/Quarter	1

- 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 Influent sampling shall be performed concurrently with effluent sampling.

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

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

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency ¹	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
Conventional Pollutants				
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Month	²
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Month ³	²
Priority Pollutants				
Arsenic, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Quarter	²
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Month	²
Chromium (VI), Dissolved	µg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Month	²
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	See Section IX.A	See Section IX.A	See Section IX.A	^{2, 4}
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	²
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	mg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Month	²
Hardness (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Month ⁵	²
Temperature	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	²
Turbidity	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	²
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Month	²
Iron, Total Recoverable	µg/L	24-hr Composite	1/Quarter	²
Whole Effluent Toxicity (see Section V. below)	µg/L	--	--	--

-
1. Effluent sampling shall be performed concurrently with influent sampling.
 2. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
 3. A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.
 4. For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, **Table E-6**).
 5. Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

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

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

B. **Chronic Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform routine quarterly chronic toxicity testing. If after two years of routine quarterly toxicity testing, the Discharger can demonstrate consistent compliance with the monitoring trigger, the monitoring frequency may be reduced to semi-annual, per approval by the Executive Officer. If the result of the routine chronic toxicity testing event exhibits toxicity, demonstrated by a result greater than 1.3 TUc (as 100/EC₂₅) **AND** a percent effect greater than 25 percent at 100 percent effluent, the Discharger has the option of conducting two additional compliance monitoring events and perform chronic toxicity testing using the species that exhibited toxicity in order to calculate a median. The optional compliance monitoring events shall occur at least one week apart, and the final monitoring event shall be initiated no later than 6 weeks from the routine monitoring event that exhibited toxicity.
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be 24-hour composite 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 – The testing shall be conducted using the most sensitive species. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with the cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test), unless otherwise specified in writing by the Executive Officer.
5. Methods – The presence of chronic toxicity shall be estimated as specified in *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002*.
6. Reference Toxicant – As required by the SIP, all chronic toxicity tests shall be conducted with concurrent testing with a reference toxicant and shall be reported with the chronic toxicity test results.
7. Dilutions – For routine and compliance chronic toxicity monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-4, below. For TRE monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-4, below, unless an alternative dilution series is detailed in the submitted TRE Action Plan. A receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series

Sample	Dilutions ^a (%)					Control
	100	75	50	25	12.5	
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	12.5	0
% Control Water	0	25	50	75	87.5	100

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

8. Test Failure – The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than fourteen (14) days after receiving notification of a test failure. A test failure is defined as follows:
 - a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual)*, and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or
 - b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in the Method Manual.

- 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.** Routing and compliance chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board with the quarterly self-monitoring report, and shall contain, at minimum:
 - a. The results expressed in TU_c, 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 quarterly self-monitoring reports shall contain an updated chronology of chronic toxicity test results expressed in TU_c, and organized by test species, type of test (survival, growth or reproduction), and monitoring type, i.e., routine, compliance, TES, or TRE monitoring.
 2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the quarterly discharger self-monitoring reports and reported as percent survival.
 3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for TREs shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Workplan, or as amended by the Discharger's TRE Action Plan.
 4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:
 - a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.
 - b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.
 - c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.
- E. Most Sensitive Species Screening.** The Discharger shall perform rescreening to re-evaluate the most sensitive species if there is a significant change in the nature of the discharge. If there are no significant changes during the permit term, a rescreening must be performed prior to permit reissuance and results submitted with the Report of Waste Discharge.
1. **Frequency of Testing for Species Sensitivity Screening.** Species sensitivity screening for chronic toxicity shall include, at a minimum, chronic WET testing four consecutive calendar quarters using the water flea (*Ceriodaphnia dubia*), fathead

minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), and green alga (*Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*). The tests shall be performed using 100 percent effluent and one control. If the first two species sensitivity re-screening events result in no change in the most sensitive species, the Discharger may cease the species sensitive re-screening testing and the most sensitive species will remain unchanged.

2. **Determination of Most Sensitive Species.** If a single test in the species sensitivity screening testing exceeds 1 TUc (as 100/NOEC), then the species used in that test shall be established as the most sensitive species. If there is more than a single test that exceeds 1 TUc (as 100/NOEC), then of the species exceeding 1 TUc (as 100/NOEC) that exhibits the highest percent effect shall be established as the most sensitive species. If none of the tests in the species sensitivity screening exceeds 1 TUc (as 100/NOEC), but at least one of the species exhibits a percent effect greater than 10 percent, then the single species that exhibits the highest percent effect shall be established as the most sensitive species. In all other circumstances, the Executive Officer shall have discretion to determine which single species is the most sensitive considering the test results from the species sensitivity screening.

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 the Stockton Diverting Canal at RSW-001 and RSW-002 as follows:

Table E-5. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow ¹	mgd	Grab	1/Month	2
pH	Standard Units	Grab	1/Month	2
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	2
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	2
Temperature	°C	Grab	1/Month	2
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern ³	mg/L	Grab	See Section IX.A below	2
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	2
Hardness as (CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	2
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/Quarter	2

¹ The flow may be measured at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers monitoring station MRS, on Mormon Slough at Bellota Road (see Figure B-2).
² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
³ The maximum required Reporting Level is specified in Table E-6, Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern.

2. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by RSW-001 and RSW-002 when discharging to the Stockton Diverting Canal. Attention shall be given to the presence of:
 - a. Floating or suspended matter;
 - b. Discoloration;
 - c. Bottom deposits;
 - d. Aquatic life;
 - e. Visible films, sheens, or coatings;
 - f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths; and
 - g. Potential nuisance conditions.

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

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. 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-6, below. Quarterly monitoring shall be conducted for one year beginning with the second quarter of 2020 and the results of such monitoring be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the quarterly 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-6, below.
4. **Analytical Methods Report.** The Discharger shall submit a report electronically via CIWQS submittal outlining reporting levels (RL's), method detection limits (MDL's), and analytical methods for all constituents to be monitored in the influent, effluent, receiving water, and characterization monitoring by the due date shown in the Technical Reports Table. 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-6 below provides required maximum reporting levels in accordance with the SIP.

Table E-6. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
2- Chloroethyl vinyl ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Acrolein	µg/L	Grab	2
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Bromoform	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroform	µg/L	Grab	2
Chloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Dichloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	1
Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)	µg/L	Grab	1
Naphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
3-Methyl-4-Chlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	
Tetrachloroethene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Toluene	µg/L	Grab	2
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	1
Trichloroethene	µg/L	Grab	2
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	µg/L	Grab	
Trichlorofluoromethane	µg/L	Grab	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2- Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichloropropane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichloropropylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2- Trifluoroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
1,2-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,4-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Styrene	µg/L	Grab	
Xylenes	µg/L	Grab	
1,2-Benzanthracene	µg/L	Grab	5
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	Grab	1
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	Grab	2
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
3,4-Benzofluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	5
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	5
Acenaphthene	µg/L	Grab	1
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	Grab	10
Anthracene	µg/L	Grab	10
Benzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	2
Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	µg/L	Grab	5
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	10
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	Grab	5
Butyl benzyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Chrysene	µg/L	Grab	5
Di-n-butylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Di-n-octylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene	µg/L	Grab	0.1
Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluorene	µg/L	Grab	10
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	Grab	5
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	µg/L	Grab	0.05
Isophorone	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	Grab	10
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Phenanthrene	µg/L	Grab	5
Phenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Pyrene	µg/L	Grab	10
Aluminum	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Antimony	µg/L	24-hr Composite	5
Arsenic	µg/L	24-hr Composite	10

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
Asbestos	MFL	24-hr Composite	
Barium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Beryllium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	2
Cadmium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
Chromium (Total)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	10
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	10
Copper	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
Cyanide	µg/L	Grab	5
Fluoride	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Iron	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Lead	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
Mercury	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Manganese	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Molybdenum	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Nickel	µg/L	24-hr Composite	20
Selenium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	5
Silver	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.25
Thallium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	1
Tributyltin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Zinc	µg/L	24-hr Composite	20
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.05
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.05
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.02
alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Alachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Aldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.005
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.005
Chlordane	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.1
delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.005
Dieldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Endosulfan sulfate	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Endrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Heptachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.02
Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1016	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1221	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1232	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1242	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1248	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1254	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1260	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
Toxaphene	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Atrazine	µg/L	24-hr Composite	

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
Bentazon	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Carbofuran	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
2,4-D	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Dalapon	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Dinoseb	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Diquat	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Endothal	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Ethylene Dibromide	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Methoxychlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Molinate (Ordram)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Oxamyl	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Picloram	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Simazine (Princep)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Thiobencarb	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Diazinon	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Chlorpyrifos	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Ammonia (as N)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Boron	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Chloride	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Flow	MGD	Meter	
Hardness (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	
Foaming Agents (MBAS)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Mercury, Methyl	ng/L	Grab	
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
pH	Std Units	Grab	
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Specific conductance (EC)	µmhos/cm	24-hr Composite	
Sulfate	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Sulfide (as S)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Sulfite (as SO ₃)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Temperature	°C	Grab	
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	

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.

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 and quarterly 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 the 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-7. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Month	Permit effective date	1 st day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
1/Quarter	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 (\pm 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 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 final laboratory reports from all contracted commercial laboratories, 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. **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).
 - c. **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 Waste Discharge Requirements.
 - d. **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)

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 submittal is available at the DMR website at:
(http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/discharge_monitoring/).

D. Other Reports

1. **Annual Operations Report.** By 30 January of each year, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Central Valley Water Board Electronically via CIWQS submittal 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.
2. **Technical Report Submittals.** This Order includes requirements to submit a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD), special study technical reports, progress reports, and other reports identified in the MRP (hereafter referred to collectively as “technical reports”). The Technical Reports Table below summarizes all technical reports required by this Order and the due dates for submittal. All technical reports shall be submitted electronically via CIWQS submittal. Technical reports should be uploaded as a PDF, Microsoft Word, or Microsoft Excel file attachment.

Table E-8. Technical Reports

Report #	Technical Report	Due Date	CIWQS Report Name
Standard Reporting Requirements			
1	Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD)	31 March 2023	ROWD
2	Analytical Methods Report	8 April 2019	MRP IX.A.4
3	Annual Operations Report	30 January 2020	MRP X.D.1
4		30 January 2021	MRP X.D.1
5		30 January 2022	MRP X.D.1
6		30 January 2023	MRP X.D.1
7		30 January 2024	MRP X.D.1
Other Reports			
8	Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan Summary	1 April 2023 (with ROWD)	WDR VI.C.3.a
9	Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Most Sensitive Species Screening	1 April 2023 (with ROWD)	MRP V.E

F.

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Contents

I.	Permit Information.....	F-3
II.	Facility Description.....	F-4
	A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls.....	F-5
	B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters.....	F-6
	C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data.....	F-6
	D. Compliance Summary.....	F-7
	E. Planned Changes – Not Applicable.....	F-7
III.	Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations.....	F-7
	A. Legal Authorities.....	F-7
	B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).....	F-7
	C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans.....	F-7
	D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List.....	F-9
	E. Other Plans, Policies, and Regulations – Not Applicable.....	F-10
IV.	Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-10
	A. Discharge Prohibitions.....	F-11
	B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-11
	1. Scope and Authority.....	F-11
	2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable.....	F-12
	C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's).....	F-12
	1. Scope and Authority.....	F-12
	2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives.....	F-13
	3. Determining the Need for WQBEL's.....	F-21
	4. WQBEL Calculations.....	F-27
	5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).....	F-29
	D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations.....	F-32
	1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations.....	F-32
	2. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.....	F-32
	3. Antidegradation Policies.....	F-33
	4. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.....	F-34
	E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable.....	F-34
	F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-34
	G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-34
V.	Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations.....	F-34
	A. Surface Water.....	F-34
VI.	Rationale for Provisions.....	F-34
	A. Standard Provisions.....	F-34
	B. Special Provisions.....	F-35
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	F-35
	2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-35
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention.....	F-38
	4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-38
	5. Other Special Provisions.....	F-38
VII.	Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	F-38
	A. Influent Monitoring.....	F-38
	B. Effluent Monitoring.....	F-38

- C. Receiving Water Monitoring F-39
 - 1. Surface Water F-39
- VIII. Public Participation..... F-39
 - A. Notification of Interested Persons F-39
 - B. Written Comments F-39
 - C. Public Hearing F-40
 - D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements F-40
 - E. Information and Copying F-40
 - F. Register of Interested Persons..... F-40
 - G. Additional Information F-40

Tables

- Table F-1. Facility Information..... F-3
- Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data..... F-6
- Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses F-8
- Table F-4. Summary of CTR Criteria for Hardness-dependent Metals F-15
- Table F-5. Verification of CTR Compliance for Copper F-20
- Table F-6. Verification of CTR Compliance for Silver F-21
- Table F-7. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives..... F-23
- Table F-8. Downstream TDS Concentration (Annual Averages) F-24
- Table F-9. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations F-29
- Table F-10. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results F-31
- Table F-11. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations..... F-34

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 discusses the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

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

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the Facility.

Table F-1. Facility Information

WDID	5B392058001
CIWQS Facility Place ID	239601
Discharger	SPX Marley Cooling Tower Technologies
Name of Facility	SPX Marley Cooling Tower Technologies Groundwater Cleanup Site
Facility Address	200 North Wagner Avenue
	Stockton, California 95215
	San Joaquin County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	Jim Lingo, Plant Operator, (209) 465-3451 x239
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	Jim Lingo, Plant Operator, (209) 465-3451 x239
Mailing Address	SAME
Billing Address	SAME
Type of Facility	Groundwater remediation (SIC Code 4959)
Major or Minor Facility	Minor
Threat to Water Quality	1
Complexity	A
Pretreatment Program	N
Recycling Requirements	N/A
Facility Permitted Flow	0.94 MGD
Facility Design Flow	0.94 MGD
Watershed	Calaveras River Watershed
Receiving Water	Stockton Diverting Canal
Receiving Water Type	Inland Surface Water

- A.** SPX Marley Cooling Tower Technologies (formerly Marley Cooling Tower Company), an industrial groundwater extraction and treatment facility (hereinafter referred to as the Facility) located at 200 North Wagner Avenue, Stockton, California.

For the purposes of this Order, references to the “discharger” or “permittee” in applicable

federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

- B.** The Facility discharges wastewater to the Stockton Diverting Canal, a water of the United States, tributary to the Calaveras River within the Calaveras River Watershed. The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2014-0013 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0081787 adopted on 7 February 2014 and expires on 1 March 2019. Attachment B provides maps of the area around the Facility. Figure B-2 provides a map depicting the Facility location, the locations of receiving water monitoring points RSW-001 and RSW-002, and discharge point EFF-001, Figure B-2 provides a map depicting the Stockton Diverting Canal, Discharge point EFF-001, and upstream receiving water flow monitoring station MRS (USACE), and Figure B-3 provides a Site Plan of the Facility. Attachment C provides flow schematics of the Facility, Figure C-1 provides an Overall System Process Flow Diagram, Figure C-2 provides an Electrochemical Precipitation System Flow Diagram, Figure C-3 provides an Ion Exchange System Flow Diagram, and Figure C-4 provides a Groundwater Extraction and Equalization Flow Diagram.
- C.** 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 30 August 2018.
- D.** 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. Under 40 C.F.R. section 122.6(d), States authorized to administer the NPDES program may administratively continue State-issued permits beyond their expiration dates until the effective date of the new permits, if State law allows it. 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 owns and operates a groundwater extraction and treatment system in the East Stockton Area of San Joaquin County. The Discharger previously operated a cooling tower fabrication plant at the site that included a wood preservation process using solutions containing copper, chromium and arsenic. Wood preserving was discontinued at this site in January 1991; however, past operational practices have resulted in contamination of soils and groundwater underlying the site. Soils have been contaminated with copper, chromium, and arsenic; groundwater has been contaminated with chromium and copper.

On 28 November 1984 the Central Valley Water Board ratified a Settlement Agreement among the Department of Health Services (now Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)), the Discharger, and the Central Valley Water Board. This Settlement Agreement required the Discharger to conduct a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) to define the extent of contamination, to develop a Remedial Action Plan (RAP), and to implement all measures necessary to remediate existing site contamination. Following discussions with Central Valley Water Board staff, DTSC formally adopted the RAP on 29 August 1990. The RAP included the conceptual design of the groundwater remediation project, and the recommended groundwater remedial action for the extraction, treatment, and discharge of contaminated groundwater.

A groundwater pilot study, including calcium polysulphate and ethanol injection, was initiated in June 2003 at the site to evaluate the effectiveness of in-situ reduction as a means to address mobile, chromium (VI) in the subsurface. The pilot study was conducted under Order R5-2003-0100. The DTSC is the lead agency for the site clean up. In June 2007, DTSC issued a

final RAP amendment that concluded that the pilot study successfully demonstrated the efficacy of in-situ Cr VI reduction and authorized the full-scale implementation of the in-situ treatment at the site. The WDRs for the protection of groundwater are being implemented under separate Order R5-2007-0126 issued by the Central Valley Water Board on 13 September 2007.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

The treatment system at the Facility consists of an electrochemical reduction and precipitation unit (ECS) operating in parallel to an ion exchange (IX) treatment system, the overall flow process can be seen in Attachment A (Figure A-1). The IX system consists of two anion exchange vessels and a cation exchange vessel. In the anion exchange vessels, chromium (VI) in the water is adsorbed onto the ion exchange resins. In the cation exchange vessel, trivalent chromium and copper are adsorbed. The exchange process continues until the resin's exchange sites are filled and exchange capacity is exhausted. The adsorbed wood treating chemicals are stripped from the ion exchange resins and the resins are conditioned for additional water treatment in a process called regeneration. During regeneration, which would occur approximately every 2.5 days, 15,000 gallons of solution containing the stripped chemicals are removed from the IX system and processed through the electrochemical unit. A process flow diagram for the ion exchange system is shown in Attachment C (Figure C-3). As a result of in-situ remediation being conducted at the site, multiple extraction wells have met cleanup goals. Due to reduced flow rates from these idled wells, the IX system is not used any longer and is offline.

The ECS unit consists of an electrochemical reduction (Andco) and precipitation process that uses iron as the reducing agent for the chromium (VI) followed by the addition of polymers to optimize settling. The effluent is then filtered prior to discharge. The solids from the clarifier are pumped and accumulated in a filter press. The filter press filtrate and mixed media filter backwash are returned to the treatment plant for further treatment. Filter press cake has been characterized as a California hazardous waste and is collected in roll off bins for off-site disposal. A process flow diagram for the electrochemical precipitation system is shown in Attachment C (Figure C-2).

The site is divided into two areas, the North Yard and the South Yard. All past wood treatment activities were conducted on the North Yard. Rain falling on the North Yard is collected in a storm drain system and is passed through the treatment plant in the northeast portion of the site. Due to the past practice of storing treated wood products on the South Yard, some wood treating chemicals had been detected in the storm water runoff. The South Yard surface has been cleaned and residual contamination in pipes and ditches removed as part of the remedial actions undertaken by the Discharger.

Additionally, when sufficient storm water is accumulated on the North Yard to justify treatment, the operator will manually initiate storm water treatment through the Andco system. Groundwater from selected wells will simultaneously be delivered to the ion exchange treatment system.

The groundwater treatment facility is designed to treat a maximum flow up to 0.94 mgd. Groundwater is extracted from approximately 13 operative extraction wells on and off-site. The groundwater extraction system can operate in a cyclical fashion with each of the two cycles lasting 56 hours or on a continuous basis with all extraction wells pumping at rates varying from 10 to 90 gallons per minute depending on effective capture of the groundwater contamination plume. When cycling, primary groundwater extraction is alternated between the north zone and the area south of the site. Water extracted from the north zone has higher contaminant concentrations. During south zone pumping, the capacity of the treatment plant

is not fully utilized unless supplemental waste sources are added. Flushing water may be added to supplement the groundwater contaminant concentrations. A process flow diagram for the groundwater extraction and equalization is shown in Attachment C (Figure C-4). Additionally, symbols, an instrument legend, and definitions for all of the systems flow diagrams are shown in Attachment C (Figure C-5).

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 32 T2N, R7E, MDB&M. The Facility is located at 200 North Wagner Avenue Stockton, CA 95215 in San Joaquin County, as shown in Attachment B of this Order.
2. Treated ground wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point No. 001 to the Stockton Diverting Canal, a water of the United States and a tributary to the Calaveras River at a point latitude 37° 58' 19" N and longitude 121° 13' 34" W.
3. The Upper Mormon Slough drainage course originates from the Calaveras River near Bellota then flows west-southwest from Bellota, south of the Calaveras River. The Stockton Diverting Canal is an engineered drainage which re-connects Upper Mormon Slough to the Calaveras River on the East side of Stockton. From approximately October to April each year, the East Stockton Water District dams the Calaveras River at its fork with Upper Mormon Slough, diverting flows through Upper Mormon Slough and the Stockton Diverting Canal.
4. From approximately April to October each year, flows are split between the Calaveras River and Upper Mormon Slough. A series of check dams are installed along the Calaveras River, Upper Mormon Slough, and the Stockton Diverting Canal to provide irrigation water for adjacent farmers. During this time, there are periods of limited or no flow in the Stockton Diverting Canal.

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

Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2014-0013 for discharges from Discharge Point001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2014-0013 are as follows:

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (January 2014 – June 2018)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Flow	mgd	0.72	--	0.94	--	--	0.27
pH	Std. units	--	--	6.5 – 8.5 ¹	--	--	7.5 – 7.9
Chromium (total), Total Recoverable	µg/L	50	--	--	36.9	--	36.9
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	1.4	--	15	23.7	--	23.7
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	6.6	--	17	69.3	--	69.3

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (January 2014 – June 2018)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	1100 ²	--	--	885 ²	--	1470

¹ Instantaneous minimum and instantaneous maximum.
² Annual average.

D. Compliance Summary

The Discharger was issued Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Order R5-2014-0505 for the years of 2011 and 2013, assessing a total of \$42,000 for 14 effluent violations. Of the 14 effluent violations cited in the ACL, 8 effluent violations were Group II Serious Violations of Orders R5-2003-0030 and R5-2008-0170 for total chromium, chromium III, and copper, while 6 effluent violations were non-serious violations of Order R5-2008-0170 for effluent limitations of total dissolved solids. The Discharger settled the ACL through payment in the amount of \$42,000.

The Discharger was issued ACL Order R5-2017-0529 for effluent violations that occurred during the period from 1 January 2014 through 30 June 2017, assessing a total of \$27,000 for 9 violations. Of the 9 effluent violations cited in the ACL, 8 effluent violations were Group II Serious Violations of Order R5-2014-0013 for chromium and total copper, while 1 effluent violation was a non-serious violation of Order R5-2008-0170 for effluent limitations of total dissolved solids.

E. Planned Changes – Not Applicable

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

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

A. Legal Authorities

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

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

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

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 Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins, Fifth Edition, May 2018 (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 Section 2.1 states that the beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. The Basin Plan in Table 2-1, Section 2, does not specifically identify beneficial uses for the Stockton Diverting Canal, but does identify present and potential uses for the Calaveras River, to which the Stockton Diverting Canal 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 the Stockton Diverting Canal are as follows:

Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
EFF-001	Stockton Diverting Canal	<p>Existing: Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN), Agricultural Supply (AGR), Ground Water Recharge (GWR), Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH), Water Contact Recreation (REC-1), Non-Contact Water Recreation (REC-2), Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM), Aquaculture (AQUA), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM); Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD), Estuarine Habitat (EST), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Preservation of biological Habitats of Special Significance (BIOL), Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE), Migration of Aquatic Organisms (MIGR), Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN), and Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL)</p> <p>Potential: Industrial Service Supply (IND) and Industrial Process Supply (PRO)</p>

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, including protecting rare, threatened, or endangered species. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.

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

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 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 U.S. EPA 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.*" The listing for the Stockton Diverting Canal includes: chlorpyrifos, diazinon, mercury, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, and pathogens.

2. Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL's). Not applicable.

E. Other Plans, Policies, and Regulations – Not Applicable

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 4-17.00, 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) U.S. EPA's published water quality criteria, (2) a proposed state criterion (i.e., water quality objective) or an explicit state policy interpreting its narrative water quality criteria (i.e., the 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 Section 3.1.20) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents' objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, “...*water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the*

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

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. **Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.
2. **Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of untreated wastewater, except under the conditions at CFR 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 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.
5. **Prohibition III.E (Average Daily Flow).** This prohibition is based on the design average daily treatment capacity rating for the Facility and ensures the Facility is operated within its treatment capacity. Previous Order R5-2014-0013 included flow as an effluent limit based on the Facility design flow. Flow is not a pollutant and therefore has been changed from an effluent limit to a discharge prohibition in this Order, which is an equivalent level of regulation. This Order is not less stringent because compliance with flow as a discharge prohibition will be calculated the same way as the previous Order.

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 Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 125.3.

The CWA requires that technology-based effluent limitations be established based on several levels of controls:

- a. Best practicable treatment control technology (BPT) represents the average of the best existing performance by well-operated facilities within an industrial category or subcategory. BPT standards apply to toxic, conventional, and non-conventional pollutants.
- b. Best available technology economically achievable (BAT) represents the best existing performance of treatment technologies that are economically achievable within an industrial point source category. BAT standards apply to toxic and non-conventional pollutants.
- c. Best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) represents the control from existing industrial point sources of conventional pollutants including BOD, TSS, fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease. The BCT standard is established after considering a two-part reasonableness test. The first test compares the relationship between the costs of attaining a reduction in effluent discharge and the resulting benefits. The second test examines the cost and level of reduction of pollutants from the discharge from publicly owned treatment works to the cost and level of reduction of such pollutants from a class or category of industrial sources. Effluent limitations must be reasonable under both tests.
- d. New source performance standards (NSPS) represent the best available demonstrated control technology standards. The intent of NSPS guidelines is to set limitations that represent state-of-the-art treatment technology for new sources.

The CWA requires U.S. EPA to develop effluent limitations, guidelines and standards (ELGs) representing application of BPT, BAT, BCT, and NSPS. Section 402(a)(1) of the CWA and 40 C.F.R. section 125.3 authorize the use of best professional judgment (BPJ) to derive technology-based effluent limitations on a case-by-case basis where ELGs are not available for certain industrial categories and/or pollutants of concern. Where BPJ is used, the Central Valley Water Board must consider specific factors outlined in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

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.

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.

Finally, 40 C.F.R. section 122(d)(1)(vii) requires effluent limits to be developed consistent with any available wasteload allocations developed and approved for the discharge.

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 2-1. 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 1 January 2014 through 30 June 2018, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMRs and the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).
- c. **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. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The default U.S. EPA conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 of the SIP were used to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria.

- d. **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 SIP¹ and the CTR². 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 zones³. 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 Stockton Diverting Canal is represented by the data in Figure F-1, below, which shows ambient hardness ranging from 56 mg/L to 89 mg/L based on collected ambient data from March 2014 through September 2017. 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 56 mg/L (minimum) up to 89 mg/L (maximum). Staff recommends that the Board use the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-4 for the following reasons.

- i. Using the ambient receiving water hardness values shown in Table F-4 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

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

² The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO₃), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used (40 C.F.R. § 131.38(c)(4)).

³ 40 C.F.R. §131.3(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)

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 56 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 Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16). 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-4 is consistent with the CTR and SIP's requirements for developing metals criteria.

Table F-4. Summary of CTR Criteria for Hardness-dependent Metals

CTR Metals	Ambient Hardness (mg/L) ^{2,3}	CTR Criteria (µg/L, total recoverable) ¹	
		acute	chronic
Copper	123	17	11.1
Chromium III	123	2060	250
Cadmium	89 (acute) 123 (chronic)	4.0	2.9
Lead	89	70	2.7
Nickel	123	560	62
Silver	89	3.3	--
Zinc	123	143	143

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.

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:

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

Where:

H = ambient hardness (as CaCO₃)⁷

WER = water-effect ratio

m, b = metal- and criterion-specific constants

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.⁸ 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 Stockton Diverting Canal flows are 34.1 cfs and 34.1 cfs, respectively.


Ambient conditions

The ambient receiving water hardness varied from 56 mg/L to 89 mg/L, based on 8 samples collected between March 2014 through September 2017 (see Figure F-1).

⁷ For this discussion, all hardness values are expressed in mg/L as CaCO₃.

⁸ 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4, notes 1 and 2

**Figure F-1. Observed Ambient Hardness Concentrations
 March 2014 – May 2018**



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 124 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 374 mg/L. Effluent metal concentrations necessary to meet the above calculated CTR criteria in the receiving water are calculated in accordance with the SIP.⁹ 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 U.S. EPA as “a definition of effluent water quality that is necessary to meet the water quality standards in the receiving water.”¹⁰ 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.** U.S. EPA’s simple mass balance equation¹¹ 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.

⁹ SIP Section 1.4.B, Step 2, provides direction for calculating the Effluent Concentration Allowance.

¹⁰ U.S. EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control (TSD), pg. 96.

¹¹ U.S. EPA NPDES Permit Writers’ Handbook (EPA 833-K-10-001 September 2010, pg. 6-24)

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

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-4, 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-5 and F-6 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 56 mg/L (copper and 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-5 and F-6 below, summarize the critical flow conditions. However, the analysis evaluated all flow conditions to ensure compliance with the CTR criteria at all times.

Table F-5. Verification of CTR Compliance for Copper

Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations		56 mg/L		
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Copper ¹		11.1 µg/L		
	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Copper Concentration ² (µg/L)	
1Q10	124	11	11	Yes
7Q10	124	11	11	Yes
Max receiving water flow	56	5.7	5.7	Yes

¹ 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.

² This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

Table F-6. Verification of CTR Compliance for Silver

Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations				56 mg/L
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Silver ¹				3.3 µg/L
	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Silver Concentration ² (µg/L)	
1Q10	124	5.9	3.3	Yes
7Q10	124	5.9	3.3	Yes
Max receiving water flow	56	1.5	1.5	Yes

¹ 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.

² This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

3. Determining the Need for WQBEL’s

Clean Water Act section 301(b)(1)(C) requires effluent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards, and 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d) requires NPDES permits to include conditions that are necessary to achieve water quality standards established under section 303 of the CWA, including State narrative criteria for water quality. Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R 122.44(d)(1)(i) state, “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 that 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.” Additionally, 40 C.F.R. section 122(d)(1)(vii) requires effluent limits to be developed consistent with any available wasteload allocations developed and approved for the discharge. The process to determine whether a WQBEL is required as described in 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(i) is referred to as a *reasonable potential analysis or RPA*. Central Valley Water Board staff conducted RPA’s for nearly 200 constituents, including the 126 U.S. EPA priority toxic pollutants. This section includes details of the RPA’s for constituents of concern for the Facility. The entire RPA is included in the administrative record and a summary of the constituents of concern is provided in Attachment G. For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. For non-priority pollutants the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method, therefore, the RPA’s have been conducted based on EPA guidance considering multiple lines of evidence and the site-specific conditions of the discharge.

- a. **Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** Central Valley Water Board staff conducted reasonable potential analyses for nearly 200 constituents, including the 126 U.S. EPA 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. This section only provides the rationale for the reasonable potential analyses for the following constituents of concern that were found to have no reasonable potential after assessment of the data:

i. **Chromium (total), Total Recoverable**

- (a) **WQO.** The Department of Public Health has adopted a Primary MCL for total recoverable chromium of 50 µg/L, which is protective of the Basin Plan's chemical constituent objective.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for total chromium was 36.9 µg/L based on 51 samples collected between January 2014 and June 2018. Therefore, total chromium in the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCL of 50 µg/L, and the effluent limitation for total chromium has not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.2 of the Fact Sheet).

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 U.S. EPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no U.S. EPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate. Additionally, there are no U.S. EPA 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-7. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Objective ¹	Secondary MCL ²	U.S. EPA NAWQC	Effluent	
				Average ³	Maximum
EC (µmhos/cm) or TDS (mg/L)	Varies	EC: 900, 1600, 2200 or TDS: 500, 1000, 1500	N/A	885	1470
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	N/A	534	587
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	32.4	46.4
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	860 1-hr 230 4-day	4.2	4.2

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 Objectives, Section 4.2.2.1.9 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 for protection of public welfare and 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 or Total Dissolved Solids.** 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, or when expressed as TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (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.**

The ECS treatment system that is employed to remove Cr VI from the groundwater does not add substantive quantities of TDS to the effluent. The Discharger controls pH at the influent to optimize treatment and may adjust pH at the effluent to meet effluent limits. This is the only additions that may add TDS to the discharge.

The Stockton Diverting Canal originates from the Calaveras River near Bellota and flows west-southwest to Mormon Slough. The Stockton Diverting Canal is an engineered drainage which re-connects Upper Mormon Slough to the Calaveras River on the East side of Stockton. From

approximately October to April each year, the East Stockton Water District dams the Calaveras River at its fork with Upper Mormon Slough, diverting flows through Upper Mormon Slough and the Stockton Diverting Canal.

The Discharger collects background receiving water data upstream at RSW-001 located 7500 ft upstream from discharge point, and downstream at station RSW-002 located 1450 ft from discharge point (*Figure B-1*). Flow data for the receiving water is obtained by the Discharger from the California Data Exchange Center, which reports flow data from a US Army Corps of Engineers monitoring station (Station MRS) located approximately 13 miles upstream from the discharge point (*Figure B-2*). With the agricultural use along the canal it is unlikely the flows measured 13 miles upstream of the discharge are representative of flows at the discharge. Therefore, conducting the RPA using the TSD mass balance approach, which considers flow and dilution is not feasible. Instead, RPA was conducted by evaluating quarterly TDS data measured in the canal at receiving water monitoring stations RSW-001 and RSW-002 to determine if the discharge is causing or contributing to an exceedance of the applicable water quality objectives that protect MUN and AGR beneficial uses.

MUN Beneficial Use. Title 22, section 64449 of the California Code of Regulations requires that secondary MCLs for TDS be applied on an annual basis. The annual average concentrations of TDS in the receiving water downstream of the discharge point are consistently below the secondary MCL of 500 mg/L (see Table F-8 below). This demonstrates there is no reasonable potential for TDS based on the MUN beneficial use of the Stockton Diverting Canal.

Table F-8. Downstream TDS Concentration (Annual Averages)

Year	Ann. Avg. Conc. (mg/L)
2017	91
2016	168
2015	(1)
2014	173

(1) No flow in the Stockton Diverting Canal.

AGR Beneficial Use. From approximately April to October each year, flows are split between the Calaveras River and Upper Mormon Slough. A series of check dams are installed along the Calaveras River, Upper Mormon Slough, and the Stockton Diverting Canal to provide irrigation water for farmers adjacent to the Stockton Diverting Canal. The agricultural use of water from the Stockton Diverting Canal is by request only, meaning that in dry summer months the farmers can request water be let into the canal for their use. When this occurs, there is sufficient dilution and assimilative capacity for TDS in the canal.

As shown in Table F-9 above, the TDS downstream of the discharge is typically below applicable objectives. In Table F-9 the only year where TDS levels were elevated was in 2015. During this period the Discharger reported no flow at RSW-001, so TDS was not measured at RSW-001. The downstream TDS concentrations during that period are similar to the

effluent concentrations, which confirms that minimal flows in the canal (effluent TDS average was 534 mg/L). This is not typical and therefore is not representative of the normal conditions in the receiving water during the agricultural season. Considering the TDS data downstream of the discharge when agricultural irrigation is occurring, the discharge does not have reasonable potential for TDS.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** Although there is no reasonable potential to warrant effluent limits for salinity, this Order retains the effluent limitation of 1100 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ as an annual average in a calendar year for Electrical Conductivity from Order R5-2014-0013. This effluent limit for Electrical Conductivity is established based on the performance of the Facility and will ensure that the mass loading of salinity does not increase. Electrical Conductivity is being used as an indicator parameter for salinity. **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 chromium (VI), copper, and pH. 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. **Chromium (VI) (Hexavalent Chromium)**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes maximum 1-hour average and 4-day average criteria of 16 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and 11 $\mu\text{g/L}$, as dissolved metals respectively, for chromium (VI) for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The reported maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for dissolved chromium (VI) was 23.7 $\mu\text{g/L}$ based on 48 samples collected between June 2014 and June 2018. Dissolved Chromium (VI) was not detected in the receiving water in 2 samples collected in the same time period. The MEC for dissolved chromium (VI) of 23.7 $\mu\text{g/L}$ exceeds the CTR chronic criteria for aquatic life of 11.0 $\mu\text{g/L}$, therefore, dissolved chromium (VI) in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
- (c) **WQBELs.** This Order contains average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent (MDEL) for dissolved chromium (VI) of 4.9 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and 16 $\mu\text{g/L}$, respectively, based on CTR criteria for the protection of fresh water aquatic life. These effluent limits are expressed as dissolved metals in accordance with 40 CFR 122.45(c)(3).
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Discharger operates treatment processes specific to the removal of chromium VI, and with proper operation of the existing treatment facilities, results of monitoring indicate the Discharger is capable of meeting the new effluent limitations.

ii. **Copper, Total Recoverable**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. These criteria for copper are presented in

dissolved concentrations, 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 copper. The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for copper for the receiving water. The MEC for copper was 69.3 µg/L based on 47 samples collected between January 2014 and June 2018. The maximum observed upstream receiving water copper concentration was 2.7 µg/L, based on 2 samples collected in March 2014 and June 2018. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness to compare the maximum effluent concentration (as seen in Section IV.C.2 of this Fact Sheet). Table F-4 above shows the specific total recoverable criteria used for the RPA.

Based on the available data, the receiving water and copper in the discharge have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

- (c) **WQBELs.** The MEC for copper of 69.3 µg/L was collected on 27 April 2017. The abnormally high copper concentration of 69.3 µg/L is indicative of breakthrough occurring in the treatment system, not a result during normal operating conditions. The treatment system typically produces a stable effluent copper concentration. Since WQBELs are calculated considering the variability of the treatment system, using the high datapoint during treatment system upset would result in overly stringent WQBELs. Therefore, for the purposes of calculating the WQBELs, the unusually high result on 27 April 2017 was removed from the dataset when calculating the coefficient of variation.

This Order contains a final (AMEL) and (MDEL) for copper of 6.6 µg/L and 17 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Discharger operates treatment processes specific to the removal of copper, and with proper operation of the existing treatment facilities, results of monitoring indicate the Discharger is capable of meeting the updated effluent limitations.

iii. **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.** 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 its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*” USEPA’s TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, “*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where 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 ground water extraction and treatment system that treats contaminated groundwater. Although the Discharger has proper pH controls in place, the pH for the Facility’s influent varies due to the nature of the groundwater being treated, 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, WQBELs for pH are required in this Order.

- (c) **WQBEL’s.** Effluent limitations for pH of 6.5 as an instantaneous minimum and 8.5 as an instantaneous maximum are included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan objectives for pH.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Based on available effluent pH data, it appears the Discharger is able to comply with these limitations. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. This Order includes WQBEL’s for electrical conductivity, copper, chromium VI, and pH. The general methodology for calculating WQBEL’s based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.4.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.
- b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from

Section 1.4 of the SIP:

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

where:

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

According to the SIP, the ambient background concentration (B) in the equation above shall be the observed maximum with the exception that an ECA calculated from a priority pollutant criterion/objective that is intended to protect human health from carcinogenic effects shall use the arithmetic mean concentration of the ambient background samples.

- c. **Primary and Secondary MCLs.** For non-priority pollutants with primary MCL's to protect human health (e.g., nitrate plus nitrite), the AMEL is set equal to the primary MCL and the MDEL is calculated using the AWEL/AMEL multiplier, where the AWEL multiplier is based on a 98th percentile occurrence probability and the AMEL multiplier is from Table 2 of the SIP.

For non-priority pollutants with secondary MCL's that protect public welfare (e.g., taste, odor, and staining), WQBEL's were calculated by setting the LTA equal to the secondary MCL and using the AMEL multiplier to set the AMEL. The MDEL was calculated using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP.

- d. **Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** For constituents with acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria, the WQBEL's are calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are converted to equivalent long-term averages (i.e. LTA_{acute} and $LTA_{chronic}$) using statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.
- e. **Human Health Criteria.** For constituents with human health criteria, the WQBEL's are calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The AMEL is set equal to the ECA and the MDEL is calculated using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP.

$$\begin{aligned}
 AMEL &= mult_{AMEL} \left[\min \left(\overbrace{M_A ECA_{acute}}^{LTA_{acute}}, M_C ECA_{chronic} \right) \right] \\
 MDEL &= mult_{MDEL} \left[\min \left(M_A ECA_{acute}, \underbrace{M_C ECA_{chronic}}_{LTA_{chronic}} \right) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

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

where:

$mult_{AMEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL

$mult_{MDEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL

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

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

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

Table F-9. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Chromium (VI), Dissolved	µg/L	4.9	--	16	--	--
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	6.6	--	17	--	--
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	--	--	--	1100 ¹	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5

¹. Annual average effluent limitation.

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 and chronic 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 Section 3.1.20) 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. U.S. EPA’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)." Acute toxicity effluent limits are required to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

U.S. EPA 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 Section 3.1.20) The table below is chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger from March 2014 through June 2018. This data was used to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

Table F-10. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results

Date	Fathead Minnow		Water Flea		Green Algae
	<i>Pimephales promelas</i>		<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		<i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
2/23/15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
5/19/15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	>1.0 (74.5%)
6/23/15					>1.0 (80.4%)
7/29/15					1.0
8/17/15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
9/9/15					1.0
9/21/15					1.0
11/30/15	1.0	1.0	1.0	>1.0 (67.2%)	1.0
12/28/15			1.0	>1.0 (97.8%)	
1/6/16			fTAC	fTAC	
2/3/16			1.0	1.3 (47.0%)	
2/29/16			1.0	2.0 (69.8%)	
3/10/16			1.0 ²	>1.0 (35.0%) ²	
8/22/16 ¹			1.0	1.0	
9/26/16	1.0	1.0	1.0	>1.0 (39.2%)	1.0
11/14/16			1.0	1.0	
12/5/16	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
1/2/17			1.0	1.0	
3/27/17	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
6/12/17	1.0	1.0	>1 (70.0%)	>1.0 (93.3%)	1.0
6/27/17			>1 (80.0%)	>1.0 (75.3%)	
7/7/17			>1 (40.0%) ²	>1.0 (24.0%) ²	
7/31/17			1.0	1.0 ¹	
8/22/17			1.0	>1.0 (14.6%) ³	
9/19/17	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
12/19/17	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
6/15/2018	1.0	1.0	>1.0 ⁴	1.0	1.0

Where TUc is > 1, the relative Percent effect in 100% effluent is provided.

Shaded monitoring events are TRE-related WET testing events.

1. TRE polymer optimization test
2. TRE persistence test
3. Passed TST
4. The Discharger has determined that the reduction in *C.dubia* survival in this test was caused by plant upset due to bringing the plant online after a 4 month hiatus in operation that was needed to repair damage from significant vandalization of plant infrastructure.

- i. **RPA.** No dilution has been granted for chronic whole effluent toxicity. Chronic toxicity testing results exceeding 1.3 chronic toxicity units (TUc) (as 100/NOEC) and a percent effect at 100 percent effluent exceeding 25 percent demonstrates the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

Table F-10, above, shows chronic toxicity testing conducted between February 2015 and June 2018. The effluent has had periodic exceedances of the toxicity trigger. As a result, the Discharger conducted three Toxicity Reduction

Evaluations (TREs) for *Selenastrum capricornutum* in 2015, *C. dubia* in 2015, and *C. dubia* in 2017. The 2015 TREs concluded the toxicity was caused by polymer coagulant overdosing and as a result, the Discharger adjusted polymer dosing and the toxicity caused by polymer overdosing has since been eliminated. The 2017 TRE showed there was a groundwater gradient shift, which may have been caused by extreme wet weather. As a result, the Discharger has made operational adjustments to address reduced hardness and EC in the groundwater being treated. The Discharger also failed the June 2018 toxicity test; however, this was quickly determined to be the result of a plant upset caused by bringing the Facility back online after a 4-month shutdown where significant repairs were required due to vandalism which occurred during the shutdown. The Discharger has made repairs and toxicity has been eliminated in the last two normal toxicity tests. Therefore, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

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 C.F.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.

2. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order, with the exception of effluent limitations for total chromium. The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in Order R5-0214-0013. 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 303(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.

The Stockton Diverting Canal is considered an attainment water for total chromium because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for this

constituent.¹² As discussed in section IV.D.4, below, removal of the effluent limits complies with federal and state antidegradation requirements. Thus, removal of the effluent limitations for total chromium from Order R5-2014-0013 meets the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

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

As described further in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2014-0013 was issued indicates that total chromium does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in the receiving water. The updated information that supports the relaxation of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

- i. **Chromium (total), Total Recoverable.** Effluent monitoring data collected between January 2014 and June 2018 for total chromium indicates that the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the U.S. EPA Primary MCL for total chromium.

3. Antidegradation Policies

This Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to the receiving water. Therefore, a complete antidegradation analysis is not necessary. The Order requires compliance with applicable federal technology-based standards and with WQBEL's where the discharge could have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards. The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Anti-Degradation Policy. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

This Order removes effluent limitations for total chromium 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. This Order also relaxes effluent limitations for chromium VI based on updated monitoring data. The removal and relaxation of WQBEL's for these parameters will not result in an increase in pollutants concentration or loading, a decrease in the level of treatment or control, or a reduction of water quality. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the removal and relaxation of the effluent limitations does not result in an increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving water. Thus, the removal and relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

¹² "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.

4. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains WQBEL's for individual pollutants, which are summarized in Table F-11 below. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards.

**Summary of Final Effluent Limitations
 Discharge Point 001**

Table F-11. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis ⁽¹⁾
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5	BP
Chromium (VI), Dissolved	µg/L	4.9	--	16	--	--	CTR
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	6.6	--	17	--	--	CTR
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	--	--	--	1100 ⁽²⁾	--	Perf.

¹ BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.
 CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the Perf. – Based on Facility performance.
² Annual average effluent limitation.

- E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable**
- F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable**
- G. 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 “[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Water Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains receiving surface water limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for dissolved oxygen and pH.

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. **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 site-specific Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) or, under certain circumstances, may be allowed to participate in an approved Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES) in lieu of conducting a site-specific TRE. This Order may be reopened to include a new chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE and/or TES.
- b. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for copper. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page Section 3.1.20) Based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from January 2014 through June 2018, 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 to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. If the discharge exceeds the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger this provision requires the Discharger either participate in an approved Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES) or conduct a site-specific Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE).

A TES may be conducted in lieu of a TRE if the percent effect at 100 percent effluent is less than or equal to 50 percent. Determining the cause of toxicity can be challenging when the toxicity signal is low. Several Central Valley facilities with

similar treatment systems have been experiencing intermittent low level toxicity. The dischargers have not been successful identifying the cause of the toxicity because of the low toxicity signal and the intermittent nature of the toxicity. Due to these challenges, the Central Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA), in collaboration with staff from the Central Valley Water Board, has initiated a Special Study to Investigate Low Level Toxicity Indications (Group Toxicity Study). This Order allows the Discharger to participate in an approved TES, which may be conducted individually or as part of a coordinated group effort with other similar dischargers that are exhibiting toxicity. Although the current CVCWA Group Toxicity Study is related to low-level toxicity, participation in an approved TES is not limited to only low-level toxicity issues.

See the WET Monitoring Flow Chart (Figure F-2), below, for further clarification of the decision points for determining the need for TES/TRE initiation.

Figure F-2
WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart



¹ The Discharger may participate in an approved TES if the discharge has exceeded the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger twice or more in the past 12 month period and the cause is not identified and/or addressed.
² The Discharger may elect to take additional samples to determine the 3 sample median. The samples shall be collected at least one week apart and the final sample shall be within 6 weeks of the initial sample exhibiting toxicity.
³ The Discharger may participate in an approved TES instead of a TRE if the Discharger has conducted a TRE within the past 12 months and has been unsuccessful in identifying the toxicant.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** An Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity is required to be maintained in this Order to ensure adequate measures are developed and implemented by the Discharger to reduce the discharge of salinity to the Stockton Diverting Canal.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications – Not Applicable

5. Other Special Provisions

- a. **Release Prevention/Contingency Measures Plan.** To control accidental discharges and minimize the effects of such events, the Discharger is required to update and continue implementation of release prevention and contingency measures. These plans shall include proposed modifications to the treatment system and describe implementation of additional monitoring and inspections in the event of an accidental discharge or spill.

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 total suspended solids, total chromium, copper, and arsenic (1/Quarter) have been retained from Order No. R5-2014-0013.

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, pH, total suspended solids, total recoverable copper, dissolved chromium (VI), dissolved oxygen, electrical conductivity, hardness, temperature, turbidity, and total dissolved solids (1/month) and arsenic and iron (1/quarter) have been retained from Order R5-2014-0013 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters.
3. Monitoring data collected over the previous permit term for total chromium 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. R5-2014-0013.
4. 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 accredits 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) Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Quarterly 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** 2/Year chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

C. 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.

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Central Valley Water Board has considered the issuance of WDR’s that will serve as an NPDES permit for SPX Marley Cooling Technologies Groundwater Cleanup Site. 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 Persons

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 posting of the Notice of Public Hearing at the front entrance to the Facility, the Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin, located at 180 E. Weber Ave. Stockton, CA, and at the East Stockton Station United States Post Office located at 3333 E. Main St. Stockton, CA.

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 21 December 2018.

C. Public Hearing

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

Date: 7/8 February 2019
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 person aggrieved by this action of the Central Valley Water Board may petition the State Water board to review the action in accordance with Water Code section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 2050 and following. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., within 30 calendar days of the date of adoption of this Order at the following address, except that if the thirtieth day following the date of this Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day:

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

Or by email at waterqualitypetitions@waterboards.ca.gov

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 Mr. Tyson Pelkofer at 916-464-4853 or Tyson.pelkofer@waterboards.ca.gov.

G.

ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	23.7	ND	11	16	11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES
Chromium (total), Total Recoverable	µg/L	36.9	ND	50	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	50	NO
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	7.5	2.7	11	17	11	1300	N/A	N/A	1000	YES
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	1470	308	900	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	900	NO ¹

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 See Section IV.C.3.ii of Attachment F for discussion of reasonable potential analysis for salinity.

H.

ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBEL'S

Aquatic Life WQBEL's Calculations																	
Parameter	Units	Criteria		B	CV Eff	Dilution Factors		Aquatic Life Calculations							Final Effluent Limitations		
		CMC	CCC			CMC	CCC	ECA Multiplier _{acute}	LTA _{acute}	ECA Multiplier _{chronic}	LTA _{chronic}	AMEL Multiplier ₉₅	AWEL Multiplier	MDEL Multiplier ₉₉	AMEL ¹	AWEL ²	MDEL ³
Chromium (VI)	mg/L	16	11	ND	2.8 ⁴	--	--	0.1	1.5	0.15	1.6	3.3	7.1	10.6	4.9	--	16.0
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	17	11	2.7	1.1 ⁴	--	--	0.19	3.3	0.36	4.0	2.0	4.1	5.2	6.6	--	17

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.

⁴ Coefficient of Variation (CV) was established in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP.