INFORMATION SHEET

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS ORDER NO. R5-2008-____
LANSING, LLC WREDEN RANCH, LLC, AND MICROGY, INC.
WREDEN RANCH DAIRY, KINGS COUNTY

Background

Lansing, LLC (a limited liability company), Wreden Ranch, LLC (a limited liability company) , Wreden Ranch Dairy, LLC (Discharger) and Microgy, Inc., a New Hampshire Corporation (collectively hereafter "Discharger") own and operate the Wreden Ranch Dairy (facility). The facility is located approximately nine miles south of Hanford, Kings County. This dairy currently operates under Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) Order No. R5-2007-0035, General Order for Existing Milk Cow Dairies (hereafter "General Order"), and Monitoring and Reporting Program R5-2007-0035.

On 13 September 2007, owners of the facility submitted an application form (Form 200) and a technical report generally describing the dairy operation and containing a plan to install a thermophilic anaerobic digester system (digester) on the facility to treat waste from the dairy operations and imported waste from various sources to produce biogas for sale to the regional gas utility company. Herd population data reported in the 2007 RWD are: 6,275 milking and dry cows. The reported herd size is within the variation allowed by the General Order (i.e., no more than a 15% increase over the maximum total number of mature cows reported in October 2005).

The digester will be owned and operated by Microgy Inc. which is also named as a discharger in the proposed Order. The digester will include a 262,000-gallon capacity steel above ground tank (AGT) to store the supplemental feedstock, a 318,000-gallon capacity steel AGT mix tank, and two 1.5 million gallon AGT digester tanks, with appurtenant pumps and piping. Digester operations will require the feed lanes and free stalls to be vacuumed or scraped rather than routinely flushed. The manure gathered will be added to the mix tank and diluted with freshwater and/or recycled digester effluent to about eight percent (8%) solids.

Supplemental feedstock will also be used in the digester. This supplemental feedstock has been described as food processing waste that may include: non-saleable (off-spec or out-of-date) materials, used cooking oil, grape seed oil, cottonseed oil, floor sweepings from food processing, (protein powders and sugary flavorings), stillage from the manufacture of corn-based ethanol, and fatty water skimmings. Because the project is new, no information is yet available about feedstock in California. Microgy does operate three digesters in Wisconsin and estimated concentrations of some of the constituents are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Selected Constituents and Estimated Concentrations for Supplemental Feedstock

Constituent	Estimated Concentration
Calcium	984 mg/L
Chloride	2,874 mg/L
Iron	320 mg/L
Sodium	2,062 mg/L
Sulfur	867 mg/L

mg/L – milligrams per liter

Approximately 77,600 gallons of manure from the mix tank and 31,400 gallons of supplemental feedstock from the storage tank will be added to the two digesters daily. The digesters will function as complete-mix reactors with a hydraulic retention time of approximately 21 days. Digester effluent will be removed from the digesters daily and pass through a screw press separator. Separated effluent liquid will be recycled to the manure mix tank or conveyed to the wastewater retention system for holding until it is applied to cropland. Separated digester solids will be stored on a concrete pad until they are used either onsite for animal bedding, or exported from the facility. The biogas will be exported prior to treatment to remove hydrogen sulfide and carbon dioxide: there will be no effluent from gas treatment generated or disposed of on the facility.

The anticipated characteristics of the dairy and digester wastewaters are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Wastewater Characteristics

Constituent	Dairy Wastewater[2]	Digester Eflluent [1]
Bicarbonate	1,689 mg/L	Not reported
Calcium	167 mg/L	1,505 mg/L
Carbonate	ND	Not reported
Electrical Conductivity	3,800 µmhos/cm	Not reported
Magnesium	83 mg/L	Not reported
pH	7.4	8.3

1 – Source: Larry Walker Associates email of 24 October 2007 from Robert Smith to David Sholes
2 - Based on average of 178 samples collected from 21 dairies in southern San Joaquin Valley
mg/L – milligram per liter µmhos/cm – micro mhos per centimeter
ND - not detected

There will be four waste streams entering the wastewater retention ponds: process wastewater from the milk parlor, digester effluent, biogas scrubber effluent, and stormwater runoff from the production area. The owners and operators of the facility and Microgy, Inc. (collectively, "Discharger") report that dilution water (fresh water) will be added to the wastewater retention system to reduce salt concentration. Given the operational parameters described in the Report of Waste Discharge, the annual average salinity concentration in the wastewater retention ponds should not exceed 4,350 mg/L total dissolved solids (TDS) or 8,050 micromhos per centimeter (µmhos/cm) electrical conductivity (EC).

The anticipated dairy and digester operations are estimated to generate approximately 63,125,000 gallons or 8.44 million cubic feet of wastewater during a typical rainy season. The currently existing wastewater retention system appears to have adequate capacity (approximately 8.11 million cubic feet) to meet the Title 27 CCR §22562 and §22563 requirements.

Groundwater Conditions and Existing Land Use

The western-half of the facility is underlain by a shallow, semi-confining clay layer which supports a shallow water zone that can be encountered at estimated depths from 5 to 10 feet bgs. The shallow water zone is recharged by infiltration of surface water applied with irrigation and underflow from unlined canals and ditches. Vertical flow toward the regional unconfined aquifer is impeded by the semi-confining clay layer. The average salinity of this shallow water exceeds the Title 22 CCR short-term exposure maximum contaminant level (MCL) for total dissolves solids (TDS).

The eastern-half of the facility is underlain by a semi-confined to confined aquifer that occurs below the E-Clay layer of the Tulare Formation at depths below 500 feet bgs (lower aquifer). The E-Clay separates the upper aquifer from this lower aquifer. Although flow between the two aquifers was originally restricted, some agricultural wells within the vicinity are likely screened within the upper and lower aquifers. These wells allow hydraulic continuity between the upper and lower aquifers, resulting in lower quality water from the uppermost aquifer to migrate into the higher quality waters just above and below the E-Clay.

The first encountered regional production aquifer lies below the semi-confining clay layer. This zone of groundwater is typically unconfined to semi-confined and may be encountered in the area of the facility at depths about 180 feet bgs based on Department of Water Resources hydrographs for water supply wells within one mile of the facility (those screened in the upper aquifer). The shallowest groundwater depth recorded in this aquifer since 1963 was at 57.5 feet below ground surface (bgs) in February 1984.

There are currently nine irrigation water supply wells at the facility. Previously submitted well construction information indicates these irrigation supply wells were completed to depths from 437 to 730 feet below ground surface. Six wells were not constructed with any surface seal. Samples collected from five of the nine Irrigation supply wells were analyzed for selected constituents. Water quality as indicated by the analytical results is excellent. The construction summary is transcribed in Table 3 and analytical data summary information is transcribed in Table 4.

Table 3
SUPPLY WELL CONSTRUCTION LOG `INFORMATION

Owner Well Number	DWR Well Report Number	Date of Well Construction Report	Depth of Well (ft.)	Seal Material	Depth of Seal (ft.)	Setback from manure area (ft)
1	286220	4/25/89	720	No seal	No seal	150
2	286219	4/27/89	470	No seal	No seal	150
3	286231	5/1/89	720	Cement	30	150
4	286228	5/3/89	437	No seal	No seal	150
5	286227	5/8/89	730	Cement	30	20
6	286218	4/28/89	480	No seal	No seal	20
7	286232	5/1/89	480	No seal	No seal	20
8	286226	5/9/89	460	No seal	No seal	50
9	286225	5/10/89	720	Cement	30	50

Table 4
Selected Constituents from Supply Wells
Samples collected 1 June and 31 May 2007

		WELL NUMBER				
Constituent	**Units**	**1**	**5**	**6**	**8**	**12**
Electrical Conductivity	µmhos/cm	491	411	417	303	327
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	358	300	282	602	215
Nitrate as Nitrogen	mg/L	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Chloride	mg/L	24.1	21.6	26.3	21.6	41.4
Sulfate	mg/L	0.6	0.7	2.0	4.7	5.2
Calcium	mg/L	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.0
Magnesium	mg/L	0.9	0.9	0.4	0.4	< 0.1
Sodium	mg/L	108	88	88	63	66
Iron	mg/L	0.05	0.04	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
Manganese	mg/L	0.03	0.04	0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
Potassium	mg/L	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5

mg/L - milligrams per liter µmhos/cm - micromhos per centimeter

< - less than

There is currently a groundwater monitoring network installed at the facility. The groundwater monitoring network consists of eight monitoring wells installed in 2004 and 2005. The monitoring wells are located in the production area with the exception of MW-3, which is located south of the wastewater retention ponds. Previously submitted well construction information indicates these monitoring wells were completed to depths from 62 to 99 feet below ground surface. The monitoring wells have either 30 or 35 feet of 0.020 inch slotted casing with 7 to 47 feet of the slotted casing installed below groundwater. Samples collected from monitoring wells were analyzed for selected constituents. Water quality as indicated by the analytical results has exceeded maximum contaminant levels established by the EPA for TDS, Nitrate (as Nitrogen, Chloride, Sulfate, Calcium, Manganese, and Arsenic since the dairy has become operational. Selected results of these analyses follow. The construction summary for the monitoring wells is transcribed in Table 5 and the selected analytical data summary information is transcribed in Table 6.

Table 5
MONITROING WELL CONSTRUCTION LOG INFORMATION

Well ID	LATITUDE NAD 83 (dd)	LONGITUDE NAD 83 (dd)	Ground Elev. (ft)	Top of screen Elev. (ft)	Bottom of screen Elev. (ft)	Well Depth (ft)	Screen Length (ft)
MW-1	36.1963	-119.6009	216.94	161.94	126.94	92.44	35
MW-2	36.1899	-119.6065	214.94	169.94	134.94	82.64	35
MW-3	36.1826	-119.6099	214.38	188.38	153.38	63.40	35
MW-4	36.1933	-119.6127	213.59	173.59	138.59	76.69	35
MW-5	36.1919	-119.6011	216.97	171.97	136.97	82.72	35
MW-6	36.1893	-119.6125	213.14	154.14	124.14	89.71	30
MW-7	36.1901	-119.6018	215.71	146.71	116.71	99.61	30
MW-8	36.1939	-119.6009	216.32	147.32	117.32	99.94	30

Table 6
Selected Constituents from Monitoring Wells

Analyte	Units	MW-1[1]	MW-2[1]	MW-3[1]	MW-4[1]	MW-5[1]	MW-6[2]	MW-7[2]	MW-8[2]
Electric Conductivity	µmhos/cm	1,200	1,900	310	2,800	2,100	1,630 - 1,660	1,830 - 1,950	2,310 - 2,370
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	920	1,500	210	2,500	1,600	1,040 - 1,070	1,240 - 1,420	1,810 - 1,930
Nitrate (as Nitrogen)	mg/L	9.7	30	1.6	13	18	5.9 - 9.6	15 - 17.6	10.4 - 13.1
Nitrite (as Nitrogen)	mg/L	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	NA	NA	NA
Chloride	mg/L	230	350	32	720	490	203 - 220	391 - 408	538 - 560
Sulfate	mg/L	120	270	14	400	250	217 - 222	160 - 175	207 - 236
Calcium	mg/L	140	250	26	340	310	154 - 169	175 - 195	264 - 281
Magnesium	mg/L	29	40	15	41	92	12 - 14	7 - 7	13 - 15
Sodium	mg/L	95	190	42	260	190	148 - 164	162 - 172	145 - 154
Ammonia (as Nitrogen)	mg/L	0.12	0.11	0.073	0.12	0.17	< 0.2 - < 0.2	< 0.2 - < 0.2	< 0.2 - < 0.2
Bicarbonate (as $CaCO_3$)	mg/L	120	250	110	270	170	400 - 410	200 - 200	150 - 160
Potassium	mg/L	1.6	1.5	< 0.5	3.0	3.0	< 1 - < 1	< 1 - < 1	< 1 - < 1
pH	NU	7.59	7.05	7.53	7.38	7.58	7.1 - 7.4	7.3 - 7.6	7.3 - 7.5
Iron	mg/L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	< 0.05 - < 0.05	< 0.05 - < 0.05	< 0.05 - < 0.05
Manganese	mg/L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.34 - 0.37	< 0.01 - < 0.01	< 0.01 - 0.04
Carbonate (as CaCO3)	mg/L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	< 3 - < 3	< 3 - < 3	< 3 - < 3
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	mg/L	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.2 - 0.6	< 0.2 - 2.5	< 0.2 - < 0.2
Total Organic Nitrogen	mg/L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	< 0.2 - 0.6	< 0.2 - 2.5	< 0.2 - < 0.2
Arsenic	mg/L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.005 - 0.006	0.003 - 0.003	0.003 - 0.003
Total Organic Carbon	mg/L	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69 - 70	69 - 70	< 0.3 - 0.5

[1] Samples collected 14 October 2004
[2] Range of four samples, collected weekly from 3 through 24 June 2005
MCL – Maximum contaminant level
mg/L - milligrams per liter
µmhos/cm - micromhos per centimiter
NA – not analyzed

Land use surrounding the facility is predominantly agricultural with scattered farmsteads according land use data published in 2003 by DWR. Nearby crops include: corn, cotton, wheat, alfalfa, and sorghum. The topographic map of the dairy vicinity, published by the U.S. Geological Survey in 1954, show several residences nearby the facility. It is presumed that these residences are served by privately-owned groundwater wells.

The most prevalent soils on the facility are classified as Kimberlina saline-alkali Garces Complex Series, a fine sandy loam with moderate to moderately slow permeability; Westcamp Series, a loam with very slow permeability; Lakeside Series, a loam to clay loam with slow to very slow permeability; and the Armona Series, a loam with moderate to moderately slow permeability.

Basin Plan, Beneficial Uses, and Regulatory Considerations

The Basin Plan indicates the greatest long-term problem facing the entire Tulare Lake Basin is increasing salinity in groundwater, a process accelerated by man's activities and particularly affected by intensive irrigated agriculture. Although a valley-wide salt drain is a desired future alternative for concentrated salt sources, Basin Plan policies and programs focus on controlling the rate of increase of salt in the Basin from all controllable sources, and particularly point sources of waste.

The procedure for the Regional Water Board to follow in establishing numerical limitations in waste discharge that will implement Basin Plan narrative objectives is described in pages IV-21 through IV-23 of the Basin Plan. The Regional Water Board must consider, among other things, information submitted by a Discharger and other interested parties and relevant numerical criteria and guidelines developed or published by other agencies and organizations on harmful concentrations of constituents.

The constituent concentrations to be included in the proposed Order and summarized in Table 7 below are what the Basin Plan and referenced documents of recognized authorities indicate cannot be exceeded without causing some adverse impact on the listed beneficial uses. For agricultural use and the waste constituents listed, crop application is consistently more sensitive than animal uses, but there may be several concentration thresholds that apply dependent upon the crop and how irrigation takes place.

While insufficient data has been reported to establish background groundwater conditions, it appears that groundwater in the regional production aquifer beneath the facility is of good quality and suitable for all beneficial uses. This Order requires the installation of a groundwater monitoring network to monitor the impact of the discharge and help develop long-term groundwater limits, the development of which is discussed further in the Antidegradation section below.

The Order uses the constituent concentrations summarized in Table 7 as interim groundwater limitations while a Groundwater Limitations Analysis is performed to determined if more stringent groundwater limitations are needed to protect water quality. These interim groundwater limitations are based on either the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for the constituent as published in Title 22 CCR or other designated Basin Plan objectives.

Table 7
Summary of Interim Receiving Water Numerical Limitations

Constituent	Units	Value	Beneficial Use	Criteria or Justification
Boron	mg/L	1.0	AGR[2]	Boron sensitive crops[3]
Chloride	mg/L	250	MUN[1]	Recommended Secondary MCL[5]
Conductivity (EC)	µmhos/cm	900	MUN[1]	Recommended Secondary MCL[5]
Nitrate as N	mg/L	10	MUN[1]	Primary MCL[4]
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	2.2	MUN[1]	Basin Plan
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	500	MUN[1]	Recommended Secondary MCL[4]

[1] - Municipal and domestic supply
[2] - Agricultural supply
[3] - Ayers, R. S. and D. W. Westcot, Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations – Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1, Rome, (1985)
[4] - Title 22, CCR, §64431, Table 64431-A
[5] – Title 22, CCR, § 64449, Table 64449-B

Antidegradation

The antidegradation directives of State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, "Statement of Policy With Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California," or "Resolution 68-16" require that waters of the State that are better in quality than established water quality objectives be maintained "consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State." Policy and procedures for complying with this directive are set forth in the Basin Plan.

Certain dairy and digester wastewater constituents are not fully amenable to waste treatment and control and it is reasonable to expect some impact on groundwater. Degradation is likely to occur from waste handling and storage and application of wastes to cropland. However, there is some uncertainty over the degree of that degradation given that the combined dairy discharge has not been initiated.

Digester effluent quality data used to develop this Order comes from one of Microgy's digesters in Wisconsin and while it is sufficient to provide a general understanding of the character of the discharge it is insufficiently detailed to perform a Best Practicable Treatment and Control (BPTC) analysis or set consistent long-term groundwater limits

that reflect full implementation of BPTC. Given the limited information, this Order takes a phased approach. Interim groundwater limitations assure protection of the existing beneficial uses of groundwater while this process takes place.

The Order first requires technical reports in the form of a BPTC technical evaluation for each component of the facility's waste treatment and control to determine for each waste constituent BPTC as used in Resolution 68-16, a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) for the cropland, and Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity control of facility waste. The results of these technical evaluations and water quality data from required groundwater monitoring will be used to develop numeric groundwater limitations for each waste constituent that reflects full implementation of BPTC and compliance with the most stringent applicable water quality objectives for each constituent. Lastly, the Order may be reopened to incorporate changes to the interim groundwater water limitations, or waste handling and treatment technologies, deemed necessary to implement BPTC.

Proposed Order Terms and Conditions

The recently adopted Waste Discharge Requirement General Order R5-2007-0035 for Existing Milk Cow Dairies (Dairy General Order) has set new standards for waste management on dairy facilities. The requirements specified in the propose Order largely reflect those of the Dairy General Order except where specific circumstances require different or more stringent discharge specifications or provisons.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

This Order rescinds the dairy's coverage under the Waste Discharge Requirement General Order R5-2007-0035 for Existing Milk Cow Dairies (Dairy General Order). The Dairy General Order was found to be exempt from CEQA provided that the dairy did not expand its cow numbers beyond those that existed as of 17 October 2005. Prohibition **A.10.** of this Order prohibits the Discharger from exceeding their October 2005 herd numbers, with a 15 percent increase allowance to accommodate normal fluctuations in herd size.

For the digester project at this facility, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) is the lead agency pursuant to CEQA and has prepared an Initial Study and a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Regional Water Board, as a responsible agency for the purposes of CEQA, reviewed and will considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by SJVAPCD in _____. [As of the date of the draft Information Sheet, the Regional Water Board has not received the lead agency's CEQA documents but has consulted regarding water quality issues. The findings and, if necessary, requirements of the proposed Order will be revised following review of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.]

Discharge Prohibitions, Specifications and Provisions

The proposed Order prohibits the discharge of wastes to surface water. This includes natural and man-made water bodies and conveyances whether surface water is present or not at the time of discharge. In the event such a discharge occurs due to a failure of proper waste management, the proposed Order specifies monitoring and mitigation of the surface water body affected. The actions required by the proposed Order include:

- Immediate termination of the discharge.
- Notification of regulatory agencies (Regional Water Board, County Health Department, Fish & Game, etc.) within 24 hours of discovery.
- Investigation to determine the extent and magnitude of the discharge impact.
- Mitigation of the degradation caused by the discharge.
- A plan to prevent recurrence of the discharge.

This proposed Order prohibits discharge of waste to groundwater that causes or contributes to exceedances of water quality objectives. This proposed Order reduces the threat of degradation of groundwater by requiring the Discharger to:

- Submit a hydrogeologic report for the area affected or potential affected by the facility to the Executive Officer. The technical report shall describe the underlying geology, existing wells (active or otherwise), well restrictions, and hydrogeology. The report shall include a Monitoring Well Installation Work Plan that recommends a monitoring well network to collect data from the unconfined to semi-confined, regional production aquifer up gradient from the influence of the facility and down gradient from each of the waste management areas (e.g., corrals, wastewater retention ponds, digester works, and cropland). The network shall be sufficient to evaluate performance of BPTC measures and to determine compliance with the Order's Groundwater Limitations. The recommendations shall be reviewed and approved by the Executive Officer.
- Conduct a performance evaluation of existing waste handling equipment, facilities, and an evalution of BPTC for the waste handling and disposal activity. A critical waste management element to be evaluated is the existing wastewater retention system. The wastewater retention ponds must be evaluated for their effectiveness to control seepage of wastewater to the upper regional aquifer below the shallow water zone. The report must include a review of treatment and control technologies, and propose BPTC measure for retention ponds.
- Develop and implement a Waste Management Plan (WMP) to document waste handling and management measures. If the existing conditions do not

comply with Title 27 confined animal facility regulations, interim modifications would be proposed to mitigate the problems. The WMP will be include a schedule of milestones and completion dates for any necessary construction and/or retrofitting of the existing physical plant.

- Develop and implement and a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) to implement waste applicaton practices in the cropland. The NMP will provide a schedule of waste and irrigation water application formulated to meet the crop needs in each field. The NMP will provide for sampling plan for wastewater, soil, crop tissue, and irrigation water, to collect the data needed to manage waste applications.
- Develop a Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan that identifies sources of salt in waste generated at the facility both in the dairy and digester operations. The report should evaluate measures that can be taken to minimize salt in the facility waste, and provide a schedule to implement these measures identified to minimize salt in the waste with the NMP.
- Develop and implement groundwater monitoring to assess the performance of the facility in meeting this proposed Order's specfications and limitations.
- Prepare a final Groundwater Limitations Analysis to propose specific numeric groundwater limitations for each waste constituent that reflects full implementation of BPTC and compliance with the most stringent applicable water quality objectives for each constituent. The data from the groundwater monitoring program and the monitoring provisions of the NMP will be used to measure the facilitiy's performance This data will be used in the the Groundwater Limitations Analysis to formulate the subsequent final groundwater limitations.

Initial Compliance Monitoring

This Order prescribes monitoring of digester effluent, wastewater in the retention ponds, and fresh irrigation water. Monthly (and weekly during the rainy season) monitoring of wastewater retention ponds' freeboard to ensure the wastewater retention systems has sufficient capacity to meet the requirements of Title 27 §22562 (a) (i.e., sufficient to retain facility wastewater generated and stormwater runoff from the 25-year, 24-hour storm). Monitoring of the wastewater application amount(s) to cropland by field and monthly monitoring of the mineral and nitrogen character of the digester effluent, wastewater in the retention ponds, and fresh irrigation water are necessary to determine: 1) the amount and basic quality characteristics of the discharge, 2) if the contents of the wastewater retention system are complying with discharge limits for TDS or EC, 3) if the application to cropland is meeting crop needs and not exceeding the salt application limitations, and 4) if there is a material charge in the discharge.

The Discharger must monitoring groundwater for waste constituents expected to be present in the discharge, capable of reaching groundwater, and exceeding the groundwater limitations if treatment, control, and environmental attenuation, proves inadequate. For each constituent listed in Section D Interim Groundwater Limitations, of the Order, the Discharger must, as part of each monitoring event compare concentrations of constituents found in each monitoring well (or water supply well) to the background concentration or to prescribe numerical limitations to determine compliance.

Reopener

The conditions of discharge in the proposed proposed Order were developed based on currently available technical information and applicable water quality laws, regulations, policies, and plans, and are intended to assure conformance with them. However, information is presently insufficient to develop final groundwater limitations, so the proposed Order sets limitations for the interim while site-specific, constituent-specific limits are developed in conjunction with a BPTC evaluation. Additional information must be developed and documented by the Discharger as required by schedules set forth in the proposed Order. As this additional information is obtained, decisions will be made concerning the best means of assuring the highest water quality possible that could involve substantial cost. It may be appropriate to reopen the Order if applicable laws, regulations, or site conditions change.