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 NO. <R5-2010-XXXX>  
NPDES NO. <CA0083488>

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT  
WATER TREATMENT PLANT  
BUTTE COUNTY

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 1. Discharger Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharger</th>
<th>The Paradise Irrigation District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Facility</td>
<td>Paradise Irrigation District Water Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
<td>13888 Pine Needle Drive, Magalia, CA 95954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have classified this discharge as a major discharge.

The discharge by the Paradise Irrigation District from the discharge points identified below is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 2. Discharge Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point</th>
<th>Effluent Description</th>
<th>Discharge Point Latitude</th>
<th>Discharge Point Longitude</th>
<th>Receiving Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Filter backwash water –Old Pont</td>
<td>39 ° 48’ 971” N</td>
<td>121 ° 34’ 786” W</td>
<td>Magalia Reservoir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Administrative Information

| This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on: | <Adoption Date> |
| This Order shall become effective on: | <Effective Date> |
| This Order shall expire on: | <Expiration Date> |
| The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements no later than: | 180 days prior to the Order expiration date |

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that this Order supercedes Order No. R5-2004-0144 except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the CWC (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on <Adoption Date>.

________________________________________
PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer
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I. FACILITY INFORMATION

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

Table 4. Facility Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharger</th>
<th>The Paradise Irrigation District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Facility</td>
<td>Paradise Irrigation District Water Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
<td>13888 Pine Needle Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magalia, CA 95954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butte County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Terrano, Superintendent, 530 877 3554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>PO Box 2409 Paradise, CA 95967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Facility</td>
<td>Publicly Owned Treatment Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Design Flow</td>
<td>2.0 mgd discharge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. FINDINGS

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

A. Background. The Paradise Irrigation District (hereinafter Discharger) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. R5-2004-0144 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA 0083488. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 06 April 2009, and applied for a NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to 2.0 mgd of Settled Filter Backwash wastewater from Paradise Irrigation District Water Treatment Plant, hereinafter Facility. The application was deemed complete on 15 June 2009.

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. Facility Description. The Discharger owns and operates drinking water treatment plant. The treatment system consists of primary filtration, secondary filtration, polymer addition, coagulation, flocculation, and chlorination. Wastewater is discharged from Discharge Point No. 001 and 002 (see table on cover page) to the Magalia Reservoir/ Little Butte Creek, a water of the United States, and a tributary to Butte Creek within Butte Creek watershed. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

C. Legal Authorities. This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by USEPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (CWC; commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters. This
Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the CWC (commencing with section 13260).

D. **Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Regional 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 Order requirements, is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes part of the Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G through J are also incorporated into this Order.

E. **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** Under CWC section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21100-21177.

F. **Technology-based Effluent Limitations.** Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at section 122.44, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR 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 CFR 125.3. A detailed discussion of the technology-based effluent limitations development is included in the Fact Sheet.

G. **Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs).** Section 301(b) of the CWA and 40 CFR 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement, that are necessary to achieve water quality standards. The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC section 13241 in establishing these requirements. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i) mandates that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBELs must be established using: (1) USEPA 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 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi).
H. Water Quality Control Plans. The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised September 2009), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Resources Control Board (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. Beneficial uses applicable to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek as a tributary to Butte Creek are as follows: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply, hydropower generation; water contact recreation; non-contact water recreation, including aesthetic enjoyment; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; cold migration of aquatic organisms; warm spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; cold spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; and wildlife habitat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point</th>
<th>Receiving Water Name</th>
<th>Beneficial Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001/002</td>
<td>Magalia Reservoir (Butte Creek)</td>
<td>Existing: Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (AGR); hydropower generation (POW); water contact recreation (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); migration of aquatic organisms, warm and cold (MIGR); spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, warm and cold (SPWN); and wildlife habitat (WILD).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Basin Plan includes a 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 CFR 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.” Butte Creek is not listed as having WQLS in the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies.

Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans. National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR). USEPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About 40 criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000, USEPA 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 water quality criteria for priority pollutants.

I. 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 USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on 18 May 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by USEPA 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.

J. Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements. In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with CWA section 301 and with 40 CFR 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board’s Policy for Compliance Schedules in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits (Compliance Schedule Policy) allows compliance schedules for new, revised, or newly interpreted water quality objectives or criteria, or in accordance with a TMDL. All compliance schedules must be as short as possible, and may not exceed ten years from the effective date of the adoption, revision, or new interpretation of the applicable water quality objective or criterion, unless a TMDL allows a longer schedule. The Regional Water Board, however, is not required to include a compliance schedule, but may issue a Time Schedule Order pursuant to CWC section 13300 or a Cease and Desist Order pursuant to CWC section 13301 where it finds that the discharger is violating or threatening to violate the permit. The Regional Water Board will consider the merits of each case in determining whether it is appropriate to include a compliance schedule in a permit, and, consistent with the Compliance Schedule Policy, should consider feasibility of achieving compliance, and must impose a schedule that is as short as possible to achieve compliance with the objectives, criteria, or effluent limit based on the objective or criteria.

Where a compliance schedule for a final effluent limitation exceeds one year, the Order must include interim numeric limitations for that constituent or parameter and interim milestones and compliance reporting within 14 days after each interim milestone. The permit may also include interim requirements to control the pollutant, such as pollutant minimization and source control measures. This Order does include compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations for aluminum. A detailed discussion of the basis for the compliance schedule(s) and interim effluent limitation(s) and/or discharge specifications is included in the Fact Sheet.

K. Alaska Rule. On 30 March 2000, USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised state and tribal water quality standards become effective for CWA purposes. (40 CFR 131.21 and 65 FR 24641 (27 April 2000).) Under the revised regulation (also known as the Alaska rule), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after 30 May 2000, must be approved by USEPA before being used for CWA.
purposes. The final rule also provides that standards already in effect and submitted to USEPA by 30 May 2000 may be used for CWA purposes, whether or not approved by USEPA.

L. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants. This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on settleable solids, total suspended solids, and total residual chlorine. The WQBELs consist of restrictions on dichlorobromomethane, aluminum, and pH. This Order’s technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements.

Antidegradation Policy. 40 CFR 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 No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board’s Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet, the permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 CFR 131.12 and Resolution No. 68-16.

M. Anti-Backsliding Requirements. Section 303(d)(4) and sections 402(o)(2)(A) and (B)(i) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 CFR 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions. All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in Order No. R5-2004-0144.

N. Endangered Species Act. 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 sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. sections 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.

O. Monitoring and Reporting. 40 CFR 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. CWC sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Regional 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.

P. Standard and Special Provisions. Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 CFR 122.42, are provided in
Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under 40 CFR 122.42. The Regional Water Board has also included in this Order special provisions applicable to the Discharger. A rationale for the special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the Fact Sheet.

Q. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law. The provisions/requirements in sections IV.B, IV.C, V.B, and VI.C.1 of this Order 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.

R. Notification of Interested Parties. The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of notification are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.

S. Consideration of Public Comment. The Regional 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 this Order supercedes Order No. R5-2004-0144 except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the CWC (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.
III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

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


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

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

E. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a pollution as defined in section 13050 of the CWC.

F. The Discharge of untreated wastes from water treatment operations to surface waters is prohibited.

G. The discharge of hazardous or toxic substances, which may include laboratory and water treatment chemicals, solvents, or petroleum products (including oil, grease, gasoline and diesel) to surface waters or groundwater is prohibited.

H. Discharge of hazardous waste, as defined at Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15, Article 2, Section 2521 of the CCR or designated waste, as defined at Section 13173 of the CWC, is prohibited.
IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. D-001

1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. D-001

a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point No. D-001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program:

Table 6. Final Effluent Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Average Monthly</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations Maximum Daily</th>
<th>Instantaneous Minimum</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Settleable Solids</td>
<td>mL/L</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day¹</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residual Chlorine</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable²</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane³</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on a design flow of 2.0 mgd.
² See interim limits below in Section IV.A.2.
³ See interim limits in Time Schedule Order No. R5-2010-XXXX.

b. 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.

c. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity. There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.

d. Average Dry Weather Flow. The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 2.0 mgd.

2. Interim Effluent Limitations

Effective immediately and ending on permit expiration, the Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following limitations at Discharge Point No. D-001 with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program. These interim effluent limitations shall apply in
lieu of the corresponding final effluent limitations specified for the same parameters during the time period indicated in this provision.

Table 7. Interim Effluent Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>Average Monthly: --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Daily: 704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instantaneous Minimum: --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instantaneous Maximum: --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Settling/Drying Pond Specifications

1. The discharge of waste classified as "hazardous" as defined in section 2521(a) of Title 23, CCR, or "designated", as defined in section 13173 of the CWC, to the settling pond is prohibited.

2. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.

3. The settling pond shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes, in particular,
   a. An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface;
   b. Weeds shall be minimized.

4. Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.

5. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger).

6. The freeboard in the settling pond shall never be less than two feet as measured from the water surface to the lowest point of overflow.

C. Reclamation Specifications – NA
V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water Limitations

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order. The discharge shall not cause the following in Magalia Reservoir/ Little Butte Creek.

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

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

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

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

5. **Dissolved Oxygen:**
   a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass;
   b. The 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor
   c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 5.0 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, raised above 8.5, nor changed by more than 0.5 units. A 1-month averaging period may be applied when calculating the pH change of 0.5 units.

9. **Radioactivity:**
   a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the
food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.

b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the maximum contaminant levels specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.

13. 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.

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

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

16. 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.

17. Temperature. The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F.

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

19. Turbidity. The turbidity to increase as follows:

a. Where natural turbidity is less than 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU), controllable factors shall not cause downstream turbidity to exceed 2 NTUs;

b. Where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 1 NTU;

c. Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 20 percent;

d. Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 NTUs; nor

e. Where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 percent.

B. Groundwater Limitations – Not Applicable
VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (federal NPDES standard conditions from 40 CFR Part 122) included in Attachment D of this Order.

2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

   The causes for modification include:

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

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

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

   The Regional Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Regional 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 Regional Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

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

d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:

i. contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or

ii. controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

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

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

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

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

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

i. Safeguard to electric power failure:

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

   ii. Upon written request by the Regional 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 Regional Water Board.

iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Regional Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Regional Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Regional Water Board and USEPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Regional Water Board, become a condition of this Order.

j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the CWC, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.

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

o. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, maximum daily effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation contained in this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by telephone (530) 224-4845 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within 5 days, unless the Regional Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by the Standard Provision contained in Attachment D section V.E.1. [40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(i)].

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

q. 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 CWC. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program Requirements

The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E of this Order.

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR 122.62, including:

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

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

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

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

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

e. **Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating CTR criteria for applicable priority pollutant inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations. 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 or include new effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.

f. **Aluminum Site-Specific Studies.** The Discharger may be required to complete and submit a report on the results of aluminum site-specific studies if the Discharger does not eliminate the discharge to surface water within the next five years. The studies would be required to determine appropriate aluminum levels necessary to protect downstream aquatic life beneficial uses. The studies could also be utilized to determine if the conditions (pH and hardness of the receiving water) that the chronic aquatic life criteria (87 ug/L) are based upon are representative of the Discharger's receiving water. The studies can present findings that support the use of the secondary MCL criteria of 200 ug/L in lieu of the chronic criteria. Based on a review of the results of the report on the aluminum site-specific studies, this Order may be reopened for revision of the effluent limitations, criteria, and requirements for aluminum.

g. **Salinity/EC Site-Specific Studies.** This Order requires the Discharger to complete and submit a report on the results of salinity/EC site-specific studies to determine appropriate salinity/EC levels necessary to protect downstream beneficial uses. The studies shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board as specified in section VI.C.2.d of this Order. Based on a review of the results of the report on the salinity/EC site-specific studies this Order may be reopened for addition of an effluent limitation and requirements for salinity and/or EC.

h. **Groundwater Feasibility.** The Discharger shall perform a groundwater monitoring well feasibility study. The study should focus on the logistics of installing monitoring wells and include a discussion on the following: any relevant information from the antidegradation analysis, seasonal groundwater levels and gradients, property boundaries, waterways, soil types, adjacent land
uses and their potential impact on groundwater quality, and potential well locations.

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity. For compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, section V). Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exhibits toxicity as described in subsection ii, below, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Workplan, 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 effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This Provision includes requirements for the Discharger to develop and submit a TRE Workplan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.

i. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Workplan. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board a TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Workplan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating effluent toxicity. The TRE Workplan must be developed in accordance with USEPA guidance\(^1\) and be of adequate detail to allow the Discharger to immediately initiate a TRE as required in this Provision.

i. Initial Investigative TRE Workplan. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer. This should be a one to two page document including, at a minimum:

(a) A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that will be used to identify potential causes and sources of effluent toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency;

(b) A description of the facility’s methods of maximizing in-house treatment efficiency and good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in operation of the facility; and

\(^1\) See the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, section VII.B.2.a. for a list of USEPA guidance documents that must be considered in the development of the TRE Workplan.)
(c) A discussion of who will conduct the Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE), if necessary (e.g., an in-house expert or outside contractor).

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

iii. Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger to initiate a TRE is \( > 1 \, \text{TUC} \) (where \( \text{TUC} = 100/\text{NOEC} \)). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE when the effluent exhibits a pattern of toxicity.

iv. Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. If the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring within 14 days of notification by the laboratory of the exceedance. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four (4) chronic toxicity tests conducted once every 2 weeks using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:

(a) If the results of four (4) consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

(b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (e.g., temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four (4) consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.

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

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

(3) A schedule for these actions.

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

b. Constituent Study. There are indications that the discharge may contain constituents that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives: Aluminum. The Discharger shall comply with the following time schedule in Section VI.C.7.

c. Groundwater Feasibility Study. The Discharger shall perform a groundwater monitoring well feasibility study. The study should focus on the logistics of installing monitoring wells and include a discussion on the following: any relevant information from the antidegradation analysis, seasonal groundwater levels and gradients, property boundaries, waterways, soil types, adjacent land uses and their potential impact on groundwater quality, and potential well locations. The study should include a recommendation regarding groundwater monitoring well installation. The groundwater monitoring well feasibility study shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board within two (2) years following permit effective date.

d. Salinity/EC Site-Specific Study. The Discharger shall complete and submit to the Regional Water Board a report on the results of a site-specific investigation of appropriate EC levels to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water (i.e. AGR and MUN). For protection of the AGR beneficial use the study must consider how climate, soil chemistry, background water quality (surface water and groundwater), rainfall, and flooding affect salinity (EC) requirements necessary to protect the AGR beneficial use. The study shall include, at minimum, the following:

i. The most salt sensitive crops in areas irrigated with Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek waters in the vicinity of the discharge under reasonable worst-case conditions.

ii. The sodium adsorption ratio of soils in the affected area.

1 See the Fact Sheet (Attachment F section VII.B.2.a.) for a list of USEPA guidance documents that must be considered in development of the TRE Workplan.
iii. The alkalinity of soils to whether site specific conditions would reduce fluoride impacts.

iv. The effects of rainfall and flood-induced leaching; and

v. The background receiving water quality.

Based on these factors, as well as economic and environmental impacts (such as increased irrigation water usage, groundwater hydraulics and degraded water quality), the study shall recommend site-specific numeric values for EC that provide reasonable protection for the agricultural supply use designation in Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek.

The study shall also evaluate the affects of the discharge and the appropriate EC levels for protection of the MUN beneficial use with Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek waters in the vicinity of the discharge used for municipal and domestic supply under reasonable worst-case conditions. The Regional Water Board will evaluate the recommendations, select appropriate EC values, re-evaluate reasonable potential for EC, including consideration of the secondary MCL for EC for the protection of MUN in Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek and reopen the Order, as necessary, to revise effluent limitations for EC. The Discharger shall comply with the following time schedule to complete the study and annual progress reports shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board in accordance with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section X.D.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Salinity/EC Site-Specific Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Submit Workplan and Time Schedule for approval by the Executive Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Begin Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Complete Study and submit Study Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Submit Study Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. **Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Study.** An effluent and receiving water monitoring study is required to ensure adequate information is available for the next permit renewal. Twice during the permit cycle, the Discharger shall conduct annually monitoring of the effluent at EFF-001 and of the receiving water at RSW-001 for all priority pollutants and other constituents of concern as described in Attachment I. Dioxin and Furan sampling shall be performed once during the permit cycle, as described in Attachment J.

3. **Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

a. **Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)**
The Discharger shall develop and conduct a PMP as further described below when there is evidence (e.g., sample results reported as DNQ when the effluent limitation is less than the MDL, sample results from analytical methods more sensitive than those methods required by this Order, presence of whole effluent toxicity, health advisories for fish consumption, results of benthic or aquatic organism tissue sampling) that a priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either: (1) A sample result is reported as DNQ and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or (2) A sample result is reported as ND and the effluent limitation is less than the MDL, using definitions described in Attachment A and reporting protocols described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, section X.B.4).

The PMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions and submittals acceptable to the Regional Water Board:

i. An annual review of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutant(s), which may include fish tissue monitoring and other bio-uptake sampling;

ii. Annual monitoring for the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the influent to the wastewater treatment system twice during the permit cycle;

iii. Submittal of a control strategy designed to proceed toward the goal of maintaining concentrations of the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the effluent at or below the effluent limitation;

iv. Implementation of appropriate cost-effective control measures for the reportable priority pollutant(s), consistent with the control strategy; and

v. An annual status report that shall be sent to the Regional Water Board including:
   (a) All PMP monitoring results for the previous year;
   (b) A list of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutant(s);
   (c) A summary of all actions undertaken pursuant to the control strategy; and
   (d) A description of actions to be taken in the following year.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

   a. Settling/Drying Pond Operating Requirements.

      i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.

      ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,

(a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.

(b) Weeds shall be minimized.

(c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.

iv. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary inflow and infiltration during the non-irrigation season. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).

v. Freeboard in the settling drying ponds shall not be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow), except if lesser freeboard does not threaten the integrity of the pond, no overflow of the pond occurs, and lesser freeboard is due to direct precipitation or storm water runoff occurring as a result of annual precipitation with greater than a 100-year recurrence interval, or a storm event with an intensity greater than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.

vi. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with the operating specification contained at section iv above.

vii. The monthly average discharge flow shall not exceed 2.0 mgd.

viii. The discharge of waste classified as “hazardous” as defined in section 2521(a) of Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), or “designated”, as defined in section 13173 of the CWC, to the treatment ponds is prohibited.

ix. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger).

x. Ponds shall not have a pH less than 6.0 or greater than 9.0.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)-Not Applicable

6. Other Special Provisions

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

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

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

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

b. Biosolids Disposal Requirements

i. The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program for biosolids disposal contained in Attachment E.

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

iii. The Discharger is encouraged to comply with the “Manual of Good Practice for Agricultural Land Application of Biosolids” developed by the California Water Environment Association.

c. Biosolids Storage Requirements
i. Facilities for the storage of Class B biosolids shall be located, designed and maintained to restrict public access to biosolids.

ii. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed and maintained to prevent washout or inundation from a storm or flood with a return frequency of 100 years.

iii. Biosolids storage facilities, which contain biosolids, shall be designed and maintained to contain all storm water falling on the biosolids storage area during a rainfall year with a return frequency of 100 years.

iv. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed, maintained and operated to minimize the generation of leachate.

7. Compliance Schedules - Aluminum

There are indications that the discharge may contain constituents that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives: Aluminum. The Discharger shall comply with the following time schedule in conducting a study of these constituents' potential effect in surface waters:

Table 9. Compliance Schedule - Aluminum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Compliance Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Submit Method of Compliance Workplan/Schedule</td>
<td><strong>Within 6 months</strong> after effective date of this Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Submit and Implement Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP)(^1) for aluminum</td>
<td><strong>Within 1 year</strong> after effective date of this Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Progress Reports(^2)</td>
<td><strong>31 January</strong>, annually, after approval of work plan until final compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Full Compliance</td>
<td><strong>Within 5 years</strong> after the permit effective date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The PPP for aluminum shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with CWC section 13263.3(d)(2) as outlined in the Fact Sheet.

\(^2\) The progress reports shall detail what steps have been implemented towards achieving compliance with waste discharge requirements, including studies, construction progress, evaluation of measures implemented, and recommendations for additional measures as necessary to achieve full compliance by the final compliance date.
VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

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

B. Aluminum Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.a). Compliance with the final effluent limitations for aluminum can be demonstrated using either total or acid-soluble (inductively coupled plasma/atomic emission spectrometry or inductively coupled plasma/mass spectrometry) analysis methods, as supported by USEPA’s Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum document (EPA 440/5-86-008), or other standard methods that exclude aluminum silicate particles as approved by the Executive Officer.

C. Maximum Effluent Limitation for priority and non-priority pollutants (Section IV.A.1.a). The Discharger shall use USEPA standard analytical techniques for analyzing priority pollutants with a maximum reporting level not to exceed the minimum levels listed in Appendix 4 of the SIP (Table 2d), or 0.05 μg/L for non-priority pollutants. If the analytical result of a single effluent sample is detected for priority and non-priority pollutants and the result is greater than or equal to the minimum levels listed in Appendix 4 of the SIP, a violation will be flagged and the discharger will be considered out of compliance for that single sample.

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

Any excursion above the 1-hour average or 4-day average total residual chlorine effluent limitations is a violation. If the Discharger conducts continuous monitoring and the Discharger can demonstrate, through data collected from a back-up monitoring system, that a chlorine spike recorded by the continuous monitor was not actually due to chlorine, then any excursion resulting from the recorded spike will not be considered an exceedance, but rather reported as a false positive. Records supporting validation of false positives shall be maintained in accordance with Section IV Standard Provisions (Attachment D).
E. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Effluent Limitation. Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE/TIE provisions of Provision VI.C.2.a shall constitute compliance with effluent limitation IV.A.1.c for chronic whole effluent toxicity.
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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 1 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.

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

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

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

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

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

Inland Surface Waters
All surface waters of the State that do not include the ocean, enclosed bays, or estuaries.

Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation
The highest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous maximum limitation).
**Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation**
The lowest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous minimum limitation).

**Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)**
The highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.

**Median**
The middle measurement in a set of data. The median of a set of data is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of measurements \( n \) is odd, then the median = \( X_{(n+1)/2} \). If \( n \) is even, then the median = \( (X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1})/2 \) (i.e., the midpoint between the \( n/2 \) and \( n/2+1 \)).

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

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

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

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

**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 Regional 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 CWC 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 or Regional Water Board.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Map drawing showing the Paradise Irrigation District's water treatment plant and surrounding areas, including Magalia Reservoir, Skyway, Paradise, and other landmarks.]

PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT
WATER TREATMENT PLANT
BUTTE COUNTY

SECTIONS 25 & 36, T23N, R3E, MDB&M
USGS 7.5' Paradise East Quad

Scale: 1” = 2000'
ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC - DISCHARGE PTS
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ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply

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

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

C. Duty to Mitigate

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

E. Property Rights

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 CFR 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 CFR 122.5(c).)

F. Inspection and Entry

The Discharger shall allow the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (40 CFR 122.41(i); CWC section 13383):

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (40 CFR 122.41(i)(1));

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (40 CFR 122.41(i)(2));

3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (40 CFR 122.41(i)(3)); and

4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the CWC, any substances or parameters at any location. (40 CFR 122.41(i)(4).)

G. Bypass

1. Definitions

   a. “Bypass” means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(m)(2).)
3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Regional Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 CFR 122.41(m)(4)(i)):

   a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and

   c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Regional Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 CFR 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)

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

5. Notice

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


H. Upset

Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(n)(3)):

a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 CFR 122.41(n)(3)(i));

b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and


3. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the Discharger seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(b).)

C. Transfers

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Regional Water Board. The Regional 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 CWC. (40 CFR 122.41(l)(3) and 122.61.)
III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

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

B. Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures under 40 CFR Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under 40 CFR Part 136 unless otherwise specified in 40 CFR Part 503 unless other test procedures have been specified in this Order. (40 CFR 122.41(j)(4) and 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 5 years (or longer as required by 40 CFR 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 Regional Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 CFR 122.41(j)(2).)

4. Records of monitoring information shall include:

   1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(i));

   2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(ii));

   3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(iii));

   4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(iv));

   5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and

   6. The results of such analyses. (40 CFR 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)

7. Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 CFR 122.7(b)):

   1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 CFR 122.7(b)(1)); and

   2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 CFR 122.7(b)(2).)
V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

A. Duty to Provide Information

The Discharger shall furnish to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA 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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 CFR 122.41(h); Wat. Code, § 13267.)

3. Signatory and Certification Requirements

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, and/or USEPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5 below. (40 CFR 122.41(k).)

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

3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.22(b)(2)); and

   c. The written authorization is submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board. (40 CFR 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
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 CFR 122.22(d).)

2. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 CFR 122.22(l)(4).)

2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 CFR 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 CFR Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under 40 CFR Part 136 unless otherwise specified in 40 CFR Part 503, or as specified in this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Regional Water Board. (40 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(l)(4)(iii).)

5. 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 CFR 122.41(l)(5).)

6. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

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

2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours
under this paragraph (40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):

   a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order.
      (40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
   b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order.
      (40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)

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

4. Planned Changes

The Discharger shall give notice to the Regional 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 CFR 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 40 CFR 122.29(b)
   (40 CFR 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 CFR 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 CFR 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

4. Anticipated Noncompliance

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Regional Water Board or State Water
Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in
noncompliance with General Order requirements. (40 CFR 122.41(l)(2).)

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

6. 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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 CFR 122.41(l)(8).)

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

A. The Regional Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the CWC, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)

All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Regional Water Board of the following (40 CFR 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 CFR 122.42(b)(1)); and

2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 CFR 122.42(b)(2).)

3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 CFR 122.42(b)(3).)
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ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), section 122.48 (40 CFR 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. California Water Code (CWC) sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) to require technical and monitoring reports. This Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements, which implement the 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 this Regional Water Board.

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

C. Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted by a laboratory certified for such analyses by the Department of Public Health (DPH; formerly the Department of Health Services). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Regional Water Board. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger, analyses performed by a non-certified 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 must be kept in the laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Regional Water Board staff. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Regional 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. The Discharger shall institute a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program for any onsite field measurements such as pH, turbidity, temperature and residual chlorine. A manual containing the steps followed in this program must be kept onsite and shall be available for inspection by Regional Water Board staff. The Discharger must
demonstrate sufficient capability (qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments, etc.) to adequately perform these field measurements. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Regional Water Board.

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

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

H. The Discharger shall conduct analysis on any sample provided by USEPA as part of the Discharge Monitoring Quality Assurance (DMQA) program. The results of any such analysis shall be submitted to USEPA's DMQA manager.

I. The Discharger shall file with the Regional Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point Name</th>
<th>Monitoring Location Name</th>
<th>Monitoring Location Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>INF-001</td>
<td>Influent Weir, 39° 50’ 608” N, 121° 34’ 912” W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-001</td>
<td>EFF-001</td>
<td>Effluent Old Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-001</td>
<td>EFF-002</td>
<td>Effluent New Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSW-001</td>
<td>Little Butte Creek/Magalia Reservoir, approximately 100 feet upstream of Discharge 001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSW-002</td>
<td>Little Butte Creek, approximately 50 feet downstream of the water treatment plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIO-001</td>
<td>Composite sample of biosolids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

A. The Discharger shall monitor the influent weir at INF-001 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Required Analytical Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity</td>
<td>µmhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ 25°C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Minerals</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Standard minerals shall include all major cations and anions and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 / EFF-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor Filter backwash water at EFF-001 or EFF-002 depending on settling pond in use 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Required Analytical Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>mgd</td>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>pH units</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTU’s</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settleable Solids</td>
<td>mL/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity</td>
<td>umhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine, Total Residual</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness</td>
<td>Mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR Priority Pollutants</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Permit Lifecycle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Effluent Toxicity</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board. Sampling for flow shall occur year-round.

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

3 Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L.

4 Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

5 Compliance with the final effluent limitations for aluminum can be demonstrated using either total or acid-soluble (inductively coupled plasma/atomic emission spectrometry or inductively couple plasma/mass spectrometry) analysis methods, as supported by USEPA’s Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum document (EPA 440/5-86-008), or other standard methods that exclude aluminum silicate particles as approved by the Executive Officer.

6 For priority pollutant constituents with effluent limitations, detection limits shall be below the effluent limitations. If the lowest minimum level (ML) published in Appendix 4 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Plan or SIP) is not below the effluent limitation, the detection limit shall be the lowest ML. For priority pollutant constituents without effluent limitations, the detection limits shall be equal to or less than the lowest ML published in Appendix 4 of the SIP.

7 Concurrent with receiving surface water sampling.

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 annually acute toxicity testing.

2. Sample Types – For static non-renewal and 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 the effluent monitoring location
EFF-001 or EFF-002.

3. **Test Species** – Test species shall be rainbow trout (*Oncorhchus mykiss*).

4. **Methods** – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-
02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded
at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved
by the Executive Officer.

5. **Test Failure** – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as
specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as
possible, not to exceed 7 days following notification of test failure.

B. **Chronic Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct three species chronic toxicity
testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving
water. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. **Monitoring Frequency** – The Discharger shall perform three species chronic toxicity
testing once during permit cycle to be submitted with the Report of Waste Discharge
no later than 180 days prior to the expiration date of the Order.

2. **Sample Types** – Effluent samples shall **grab samples** and shall be representative of
the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at the
effluent monitoring location EFF-001 or EFF-002. The receiving water control shall
be a grab sample obtained from the **RSW-001 [Upstream sampling location out of
influence of the discharge]** sampling location, as identified in this Monitoring and
Reporting Program.

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

4. **Test Species** – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth,
reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent
compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic
toxicity tests with:
   - The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
   - The rainbow trout (*Oncorhchus mykiss*); and

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
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** – The chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in the table, below. The receiving water control shall be used as the diluent (unless the receiving water is toxic).

8. **Dilutions** – For regular chronic toxicity monitoring, the testing shall be performed using 100% effluent and two controls. If toxicity is found in any regular effluent test, the Discharger must immediately retest using the dilution series identified in Table E-5, below. The receiving water control shall be used as the diluent (unless the receiving water is toxic). For accelerated and/or TRE monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the full dilution series identified in the table, below.

### Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Dilutions (%)</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Effluent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Receiving Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Laboratory Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual), and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or

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

C. **WET Testing Notification Requirements.** The Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board within 24-hours after the receipt of test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during regular or accelerated monitoring, or an exceedance of the acute toxicity effluent limitation.
D. **WET Testing Reporting Requirements.** All toxicity test reports shall include the contracting laboratory’s complete report provided to the Discharger and shall be in accordance with the appropriate “Report Preparation and Test Review” sections of the method manuals. At a minimum, whole effluent toxicity monitoring shall be reported as follows:

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

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

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

3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for TREs shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger’s approved TRE Workplan.

4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes: *(if applicable):*

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

**VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE**
VII. RECLAMATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – SURFACE WATER

A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 & RSW-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek at RSW-001 & RSW-002 as follows:

Table E-5. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Minimum Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Required Analytical Test Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>pH Units</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Quarter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>NTUs</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR Priority Pollutants</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>2/Permit Lifecycle</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Conductivity</td>
<td>umhos/cm</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Observations¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable²</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane²</td>
<td>µg/L</td>
<td>Grab</td>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹One time per week when conducting the receiving water sampling, the Discharger shall observe receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Stations RSW-001 and RSW-002 and record observations in a log pertaining to:

- Floating or suspended matter
- Discoloration
- Aquatic life
- Bottom deposits
- Films, sheens, and coatings
- Algae, fungi, and slime growth
- Potential nuisance conditions

² Required for RSW-001 ONLY. To be collected at the same time as effluent samples.

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

⁴ Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.

⁵ For priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.
IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Biosolids

1. Monitoring Location BIO-001

Within 180 days from the effective date of this Order the Discharger shall submit an update of the sludge disposal plan, which shall include the following:

1. Estimate of average annual sludge production in dry tons and percent solids.
2. Description of sludge storage and alternative uses (if applicable) to disposal.
3. A description of disposal methods.
   a. For landfill disposal, include:
      i. the Regional Water Board's waste discharge requirements numbers that regulate the landfill(s) used;
      ii. the present classifications of the landfill(s) used; and
      iii. the names and locations of the facilities receiving sludge.
   b. For land application, include:
      i. the location of the site(s);
      ii. the Regional Water Board's waste discharge requirements numbers that regulate the site(s), if applicable; and
      iii. the application rate in lbs/acre/year (specify wet or dry); and
      iv. subsequent uses of the land.
   c. For incineration, include:
      i. the names and locations of the site(s) where sludge incineration occurs
      ii. the Regional Water Board’s waste discharge requirements numbers that regulate the site(s);
      iii. the ash disposal method; and
      iv. the names and locations of facilities receiving ash (if applicable)

4. A representative characterization of sludge quality including sludge percent solids and quantitative results of chemical analyses for Title 22 metals and aluminum annually (sampling not required during years when solids are not removed from the ponds).
B. Municipal Water Supply – Not Applicable

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

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

2. Upon written request of the Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.

4. The Discharger shall report to the Regional 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. At any time during the term of this permit, the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) using the State Water Board’s California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html). Until such notification is given, the Discharger shall submit hard copy SMRs. The CIWQS Web site will provide additional directions for SMR submittal in the event there will be service interruption for electronic submittal.

2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit monthly SMRs including the results of all required monitoring using USEPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.

3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:
Table E-6. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling Frequency</th>
<th>Monitoring Period Begins On…</th>
<th>Monitoring Period</th>
<th>SMR Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>First day of the calendar month following the permit effective date</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Submit with monthly SMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Day</td>
<td>First day of the calendar month following the permit effective date</td>
<td>(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.</td>
<td>Submit with monthly SMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Week</td>
<td>First Sunday of the calendar month following the permit effective date</td>
<td>Sunday through Saturday</td>
<td>Submit with monthly SMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Month</td>
<td>First day of calendar month following permit effective date</td>
<td>First day of calendar month through last day of calendar month</td>
<td>32 days from the end of the monitoring period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/Year</td>
<td>1 January following (or on) permit effective date</td>
<td>1 January through 31 December</td>
<td>32 days from the end of the monitoring period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice during permit cycle</td>
<td>1 January following (or on) permit effective date</td>
<td>1 January through permit term</td>
<td>32 days from the end of the monitoring period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Reporting Protocols. The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable reported Minimum Level (ML) and the current Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 CFR 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 reported ML 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 as well as the words “Estimated Concentration” (may be shortened to “Est. Conc.”). The laboratory may, if such information is available, include numerical estimates of the data quality for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy (+ a percentage of the reported value), numerical ranges (low to high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.

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

d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the 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. **Compliance Determination.** Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants shall be determined using sample reporting protocols defined above and in Attachment A of this Order. For purposes of reporting and administrative enforcement by the Regional Water Board and the State Water Board, the Discharger shall be deemed out of compliance with effluent limitations 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).

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

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

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

7. 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 WDRs; 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. SMRs must be submitted to the Regional Water Board, signed and certified as required by the Standard Provisions (Attachment D), to the address listed below:
C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) – Not Applicable

D. Other Reports

1. **Progress Reports.** As specified in the compliance time schedules required in the Special Provisions contained in section VI of the Order, progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the following reporting requirements. At minimum, the progress reports shall include a discussion of the status of final compliance, whether the Discharger is on schedule to meet the final compliance date, and the remaining tasks to meet the final compliance date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Provision</th>
<th>Reporting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit Method of Compliance Workplan for Aluminum</td>
<td>Within 6 months after effective date of this Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Prevention Plan for Aluminum</td>
<td>1 June, annually, after approval of workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan</td>
<td>1 June, annually, until final compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater Monitoring Well Feasibility Study</td>
<td>1 June, annually, until final compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRE Workplan</td>
<td>Within 90 days of permit effective date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sludge Disposal Plan</td>
<td>Within 180 days of permit effective date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Discharger shall report the results of any special studies, acute and chronic toxicity testing, TRE/TIE, PMP, and Pollution Prevention Plan required by Special Provisions VI.C.2 of this Order. The Discharger shall report the progress in satisfaction of compliance schedule dates specified in the Special Provision at section VI.C.7 of this Order. The Discharger shall submit reports **with the first monthly SMR scheduled to be submitted on or immediately following the report due date AND/OR in compliance with SMR reporting requirements described in subsection X.B.5 above.**

3. Within 60 days of permit adoption, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining minimum levels, method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval, with a goal to achieve detection levels below applicable water quality criteria. At a minimum, the Discharger shall comply with the monitoring requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the SIP.
4. **Annual Operations Report.** By 30 January of each year, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing the following:

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

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

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

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

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

As described in the Findings in section II of this Order, this Fact Sheet includes the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

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

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the Facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table F-1. Facility Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Contact, Title and Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major or Minor Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat to Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretreatment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Permitted Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Design Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Water Type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Paradise Irrigation District (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of Paradise Water Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a Drinking Water Treatment Plant.
B. 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.

C. The Facility discharges wastewater to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek, a water of the United States, and is currently regulated by Order No. R5-2004-0144 which was adopted on 15 October 2004 and expired on 1 October 2009. The terms and conditions of the current Order have been automatically continued and remain in effect until new Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit are adopted pursuant to this Order.

D. The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge and submitted an application for renewal of its Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit on 6 April 2009. Supplemental information was requested on 16 July 2009 and received on 5 August 2009. A site visit was conducted on 21 September 2009 and 5 November 2009, to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and conditions.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides drinking water service for the community of Paradise, CA and serves a population of approximately 27,000. The design daily average flow capacity of the Facility is 2.0 million gallons per day (mgd) of settled filter backwash water.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls

Wastewaters from the facility consists of clarifier wash water, filter backwash water, filter-to-waste waters, waters collected in floor and lab drains and waters collected in drain from containment areas. At peak capacity the facility could discharge 2.0 mgd and averages about 800,000 mgd of wastewater. Wastewaters are routed to a wash water equalization tank and then pumped approximately one quarter mile to two settling basins prior to discharge to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek. Annually, the water treatment plant alternates use between a “new” and an “old” two cell settling basin to allow drying and solids removal. Approximately 80 tons of solids are transported annually to a Class III landfill. Domestic waste from the facility is discharged to an on site septic tank and leach field.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 25, T23N, R3E, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.

2. Settled Filter Backwash Water is discharged at Discharge Point D-001 to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek, a water of the United States and a tributary to Butte Creek at a point latitude 39° 48’ 59” N and longitude 121° 34’ 50” W.
C. Summary of Historical Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data

**Effluent limitations AND/OR Discharge Specifications** contained in Order No. R5-2004-0144 for discharges from Discharge Point No. 001 and representative monitoring data from the term of Order No. R5-2004-0144 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitation</th>
<th>Monitoring Data (From 15 October 2004 To 15 October 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Monthly</td>
<td>Average Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settleable Solids</td>
<td>mL/L</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>pH units</td>
<td>6(^1)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Instantaneous minimum.

D. Compliance Summary

The Discharger was in compliance with Order No. R5-2004-0144.

E. Planned Changes – Not Applicable

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the applicable plans, policies, and regulations identified in the Findings in section II of this Order. The applicable plans, policies, and regulations relevant to the discharge include the following:

A. Legal Authorities

This Order is issued pursuant to regulations in the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code (CWC) as specified in the Finding contained at section II.C of this Order.

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

This Order meets the requirements of CEQA as specified in the Finding contained at section II.E of this Order.
C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans

1. Water Quality Control Plans. This Order implements the following water quality control plans as specified in the Finding contained at section II.H of this Order.


2. National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR). This Order implements the NTR and CTR as specified in the Finding contained at section II.I of this Order.

3. State Implementation Policy (SIP). This Order implements the SIP as specified in the Finding contained at section II.I of this Order.

4. Alaska Rule. This Order is consistent with the Alaska Rule as specified in the Finding contained at section II.L of this Order.

5. Antidegradation Policy. As specified in the Finding contained at section II.N of this Order and as discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section IV.D.4.), the discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR section 131.12 and State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Resolution 68-16.

6. Anti-Backsliding Requirements. This Order is consistent with anti-backsliding policies as specified in the Finding contained at section II.M of this Order. Compliance with the anti-backsliding requirements is discussed in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section IV.D.3).

7. Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act

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

   The Regional Water Board has adopted numeric water quality objectives in the Basin Plan for the following constituents: aluminum and dichlorobromomethane, for which numeric water quality objectives have been adopted for the receiving waters involved in this discharge. As detailed elsewhere in this Permit, available effluent quality data indicate that none of these constituents have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above any numeric water quality
objectives included within the Basin Plan or in any State Water Board plan, so no effluent limitations are included in this permit pursuant to CWC Section 13263.6(a).

8. **Storm Water Requirements – NA**

USEPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from water treatment facilities. Water treatment facilities are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The Facility is not regulated under the storm water program because all storm water is contained on site.

9. **Endangered Species Act.** This Order is consistent with the Endangered Species Act as specified in the Finding contained at section II.P of this Order.

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 30 November 2006 USEPA gave final approval to California's 2006 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 CFR Part 130, et seq.).” The Basin Plan also states, “Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.” Total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) have not been proposed for Butte Creek.

E. **Other Plans, Polices and Regulations**

1. The discharge authorized herein and the treatment and storage facilities associated with the discharge of treated municipal wastewater, except for discharges of residual sludge and solid waste, are exempt from the requirements of Title 27, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 20005 et seq. (hereafter Title 27). The exemption, pursuant to Title 27 CCR section 20090(b), is based on the following:

   a. The applicable RWQCB has issued WDRs, reclamation requirements, or waived such issuance;

   b. The discharge is in compliance with the applicable water quality control plan; and

   a. The wastewater does not need to be managed according to Chapter 11, Division 4.5, Title 22 of this code as a hazardous waste.
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 CFR 122.44(d)(1)]. NPDES permits must incorporate discharge limits necessary to ensure that water quality standards are met. This requirement applies to narrative criteria as well as to criteria specifying maximum amounts of particular pollutants. Pursuant to federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that “are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality.” Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi), further provide that “[w]here a state has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in an effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits.”

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

The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, discoloration, radionuclides, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at III-8.00.) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative
toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, “…water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)” in Title 22 of CCR. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Regional 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. As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), define “bypass” as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Water Board’s prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Board adopted a precedential decision, Order No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation, provided that the bypass does not cause violation of effluent and/or receiving water limitations.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at 40 CFR 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 CFR 125.

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 performance by plants 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 the “cost reasonableness” of the relationship between the cost of attaining a reduction in effluent discharge and the benefits that would result, and also the cost effectiveness of additional industrial treatment beyond BPT.

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 USEPA to develop effluent limitations, guidelines and standards (ELGs) representing application of BPT, BAT, BCT, and NSPS. CWA section 402(a)(1) and 40 CFR 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 permit writer must consider specific factors outlined in 40 CFR 125.3.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

a. Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and Settleable Solids. For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states, “[w]ater shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.” Order No. R5-2004-0144 established effluent limitations for settleable solids which are technology-based effluent limitations (TBELs) for water treatment plants based on BPJ. This Order carries over the settleable solid TBELs established by Order No. R5-2004-0144. These effluent limitations reflect removal efficiencies for properly designed, constructed, and operated water treatment systems. Because the amount of settleable solids is measured in terms of volume per volume without a mass component, it is impracticable to calculate mass limitations for inclusion in this Order.

The Basin Plan includes water quality objectives that receiving waters not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. This Order contains average monthly and maximum daily effluent limits for TSS of 30 and 50 mg/L, respectively. The Regional Water Board has determined that TSS are more likely to be resuspended than settleable solids in the wastewater settling ponds before discharge, and therefore, TSS concentrations are more likely to vary in the discharge than concentrations of settleable solids. To establish effluent limits for TSS, the Regional Water Board has examined several general permits, which regulate wastewater discharges from water treatment plants. A summary of these TSS limitations is presented in the table, below.
TSS Effluent Limitations for General Permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Average Monthly</th>
<th>Average Weekly</th>
<th>Maximum Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (Regional Water Board 2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Settleable solids, not TSS, is limited.

The Regional Water Board has also relied on research performed for the USEPA in 1987 (SAIC, Model Permit Package for the Water Supply Industry, EPA Contract No. 68-01-7043). This study found that 76 percent of water treatment plants surveyed used sedimentation lagoons for wastewater treatment. In these facilities, limitations of 30 mg/L and 45 mg/L were representative of the, then, current permitting practice for average monthly and maximum daily TSS limitations, respectively. Analysis of actual monitoring data from these facilities showed the 95th percent occurrence (monthly average) and 99th percent occurrence (maximum daily) levels of treatment to be 3.38 mg/L and 6.0 mg/L, respectively. The study recommended limitations of 30 mg/L and 45 mg/L as the monthly average and daily maximum TSS limitations for a model NPDES permit. Using BPJ pursuant to Section 402 (a)(1)(b) of the CWA, the Regional Water Board is establishing average monthly and maximum daily, TBELs for TSS of 30 and 50 mg/L, respectively.

b. Flow. This Order contains a daily maximum discharge flow effluent limit of 2.0 mgd at Discharge D-001.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Effluent Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Settleable Solids</td>
<td>mL/L</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residual Chlorine</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-3. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations, Discharge Point No. D-001
C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i) mandates that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBELs must be established using: (1) USEPA 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 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

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

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

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

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

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

a. Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.

The Basin Plan at II-2.00 states that the beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. The Basin Plan does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Magalia Reservoir, but does identify present and potential uses for Butte Creek, to which Magalia Reservoir, via Little Butte Creek, is tributary. Thus, beneficial uses applicable to Magalia Reservoir are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discharge Point</th>
<th>Receiving Water Name</th>
<th>Beneficial Use(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Magalia Reservoir/Butte Creek</td>
<td>Existing: Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (AGR); hydropower generation (POW); water contact recreation (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); migration of aquatic organisms, warm and cold (MIGR); spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, warm and cold (SPWN); and wildlife habitat (WILD).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 November 2008 and November 2009, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMRs, the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD). Additional data was collected during a Central Valley Water Board inspection on 5 November 2009.

c. Priority Pollutant Metals

The California Toxics Rule and the National Toxics Rule contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.
This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness as required by the SIP\(^1\), the CTR\(^2\) and State Water Board Order No. WQO 2008-0008 (City of Davis). The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. (SIP, § 1.2; 40 CFR § 131.38(c)(4), Table 4, note 4.) The CTR does not define whether the term “ambient,” as applied in the regulations, necessarily requires the consideration of upstream as opposed to downstream hardness conditions. In some cases, the hardness of effluent discharges changes the hardness of the ambient receiving water. Therefore, where reliable, representative data are available, the hardness value for calculating criteria can be the downstream receiving water hardness, after mixing with the effluent (Order WQO 2008-0008, p. 11). The Regional Water Board thus has considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness (\(\text{Id.},\ p.10\)).

The hardness values must also be protective under all flow conditions (\(\text{Id.},\ pp.\ 10-11\)). As discussed below, scientific literature provides a reliable method for calculating protective hardness-dependent CTR criteria, considering all discharge conditions. This methodology produces criteria that ensure these metals do not cause receiving water toxicity, while avoiding criteria that are unnecessarily stringent.

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

- For comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, in accordance with the SIP, CTR, and Order WQO 2008-0008, the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness was used to adjust the criterion. In this evaluation the portion of the receiving water affected by the discharge is analyzed. For hardness-dependent criteria, the hardness of the effluent has an impact on the determination of the applicable criterion in areas in the receiving water affected by the discharge. Therefore, for this situation it is

---

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

\(^{2}\) The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO\(_3\)), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used. It further requires that the hardness values used must be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones.
necessary to consider the hardness of the effluent in determining the applicable hardness to adjust the criterion. The procedures for determining the applicable criterion after proper adjustment using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness is outlined in subsection ii. below.

- For comparing the Maximum Ambient Background Concentration to the applicable criterion, in accordance with the SIP, CTR, and Order WQO 2008-0008, the reasonable worst-case upstream hardness was used to adjust the criterion. In this evaluation the area outside the influence of the discharge is analyzed. For this situation, the discharge does not impact the upstream hardness. Therefore, the effect of the effluent hardness was not included in this evaluation.

a) **Discharge Point No. D-001.** The upstream receiving water hardness in Magalia Reservoir ranged from 32 mg/L to 38 mg/L, based on 6 samples from November 2008 through December 2009. Thus, a minimum upstream receiving water hardness of 32 mg/L (as CaCO₃) represents the reasonable worst-case upstream hardness and was used to adjust the criterion when comparing the Maximum Background Ambient Concentration to the criterion for the discharge to the Magalia Reservoir at Discharge Point No. D-001. For comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, in accordance with the SIP, CTR, and Order WQO 2008-0008, the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness was used to adjust the criterion. The procedures for determining the applicable criterion after proper adjustment using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness is outlined in subsection ii. below.

ii. **Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) Calculations.** A 2006 Study¹ developed procedures for calculating the effluent concentration allowance (ECA)² for CTR hardness-dependent metals. The 2006 Study demonstrated that it is necessary to evaluate all discharge conditions (e.g. high and low flow conditions) and the hardness and metals concentrations of the effluent and receiving water when determining the appropriate ECA for these hardness-dependent metals. Simply using the lowest recorded upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the ECA may result in over or under protective WQBELs.

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

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


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

\[ H = \text{hardness (as CaCO}_3\text{)} \]
\[ \text{WER} = \text{water-effect ratio} \]
\[ m, b = \text{metal- and criterion-specific constants} \]

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

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

\[ ECA = C \quad \text{when} \quad C \leq B \]

(Equation 2)

Where

\[ C = \text{the priority pollutant criterion/objective, adjusted for hardness (see Equation 1, above)} \]
\[ B = \text{the ambient background concentration} \]

The 2006 Study demonstrated that the relationship between hardness and the calculated criteria is the same for some metals, so the same procedure for calculating the ECA may be used for these metals. The same procedure can be used for chronic cadmium, chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc. These metals are hereinafter referred to as “Concave Down Metals”. “Concave Down” refers to the shape of the curve represented by the relationship between hardness and the CTR criteria in Equation 1. Another similar procedure can be used for determining the ECA for acute cadmium, lead, and acute silver, which are referred to hereafter as “Concave Up Metals”.

**ECA for Concave Down Metals** – For Concave Down Metals (i.e., chronic cadmium, chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc) the 2006 Study demonstrates that when the effluent is in compliance with the CTR criteria and the upstream receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria, any mixture of the effluent and receiving water will always be in compliance with the CTR criteria. Therefore, based on any observed ambient background hardness, no receiving water assimilative capacity for metals (i.e., ambient background metals concentrations are at their respective CTR criterion) and the minimum effluent hardness, the ECA calculated using Equation 1 with a hardness equivalent to the minimum effluent hardness is protective under all discharge conditions (i.e., high and low dilution conditions and under all

---

1 The 2006 Study assumes the ambient background metals concentration is equal to the CTR criterion (i.e. \( C \leq B \))
mixtures of effluent and receiving water as the effluent mixes with the receiving water). This is applicable whether the effluent hardness is less than or greater than the ambient background receiving water hardness. The effluent hardness ranged from 29 mg/L to 35 mg/L (as CaCO₃), based on 6 samples from November 2008 through December 2009. The upstream receiving water hardness in Magalia Reservoir varied from 32 mg/L to 38 mg/L (as CaCO₃), based on 6 samples from November 2008 through December 2009. Based on the RPA analysis, there is no reasonable potential for these “concave down metals” to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any applicable priority pollutant criterion or objective.

ECA for Concave Up Metals – For Concave Up Metals (i.e., acute cadmium, lead, and acute silver), the 2006 Study demonstrates that due to a different relationship between hardness and the metals criteria, the effluent and upstream receiving water can be in compliance with the CTR criteria, but the resulting mixture may be out of compliance. Therefore, the 2006 Study provides a mathematical approach to calculate the ECA to ensure that any mixture of effluent and receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria (see Equation 3, below). The ECA, as calculated using Equation 3, is based on the reasonable worst-case ambient background hardness, no receiving water assimilative capacity for metals (i.e., ambient background metals concentrations are at their respective CTR criterion), and the minimum observed effluent hardness. The reasonable worst-case ambient background hardness depends on whether the effluent hardness is greater than or less than the upstream receiving water hardness. There are circumstances where the conservative ambient background hardness assumption is to assume that the upstream receiving water is at the highest observed hardness concentration. The conservative upstream receiving water condition as used in the Equation 3 below is defined by the term H_{rw}.

\[
ECA = \left( \frac{m(H_{e} - H_{rw})e^{m[ln(H_{e})+b]}}{H_{rw}} \right) + e^{m[ln(H_{rw})+b]} \quad \text{(Equation 3)}
\]

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

\[H_{e} = \text{minimum observed effluent hardness}\]

\[H_{rw} = \text{minimum observed upstream receiving water hardness when the minimum effluent hardness is always greater than observed upstream receiving water hardness (H_{rw} < H_{e})}\]

- or -

\[H_{rw} = \text{maximum observed upstream receiving water hardness when the minimum effluent hardness is always less than observed upstream receiving water hardness (H_{rw} > H_{e})}\]

1 When the minimum effluent hardness falls within the range of observed receiving water hardness concentrations, Equation 3 is used to calculate two ECAs, one based on the minimum observed upstream receiving water hardness and one based on the maximum observed upstream receiving water hardness. The
Based on the RPA analysis, there is no reasonable potential for these “concave up metals” to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any applicable priority pollutant criterion or objective.

d. Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone

USEPA established numeric criteria for priority toxic pollutants in the California Toxics Rule (CTR). The State Water Resources Control Board adopted the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (SIP) to implement the CTR. The Regional Water Board’s Basin Plan allows mixing zones provided the Discharger has demonstrated that the mixing zone will not adversely impact beneficial uses. The Basin Plan further requires that in determining the size of a mixing zone, the Regional Water Board will consider the applicable procedures in USEPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook and the Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control (TSD). It is the Regional Water Board’s discretion whether to allow a mixing zone. The SIP, in part, states that mixing zones shall not:

- Compromise the integrity of the entire water body;
- Cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone;
- Restrict passage of aquatic life;
- Adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including but not limited to, habitat of species listed under Federal or State endangered species laws;
- Produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life;
- Result in floating debris, oil, or scum;
- Produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity;
- Cause objectionable bottom deposits;
- Cause nuisance;
- Be allowed at or near any drinking water intake;
- Dominate the receiving water body; and,
- Overlap a mixing zone from a different outfall.

USEPA’s Water Quality Standards Handbook (WQSH) states that States may, at their discretion, allow mixing zones. The WQSH recommends that mixing zones be defined on a case-by-case basis after it has been determined that the assimilative capacity of the receiving stream can safely accommodate the discharge. This assessment should take into consideration the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the discharge and the receiving stream; the life history of and behavior of organisms in the receiving stream; and the desired uses of the waters. Mixing zones should not be allowed where they...

---

minimum of the two calculated ECAs represents the ECA that ensures any mixture of effluent and receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria.
may endanger critical areas (e.g., drinking water supplies, recreational areas, breeding grounds and areas with sensitive biota). USEPA’s TSD states, in part in Section 4.3.1, that mixing zones should not be permitted where they may endanger critical areas.

The Basin Plan, the SIP and USEPA’s TSD state that allowance of a mixing zone is discretionary on the part of the Regional Water Board. Mixing zones will be limited to the amount of assimilative capacity necessary to comply with discharge limitations. The Discharger is not requesting a mixing zone.

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

a. Constituents with Limited Data – Not Applicable

b. Constituents with No Reasonable Potential. WQBELs are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential; 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.

c. Constituents with Reasonable Potential. The Regional 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 dichlorobromomethane and aluminum. WQBELs for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

i. Aluminum

(a) WQO. USEPA developed National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) for protection of freshwater aquatic life for aluminum. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for aluminum are 87 µg/L and 750 µg/L, respectively, for waters with a pH of 6.5 to 9.0. USEPA recommends that the ambient criteria are protective of the aquatic beneficial uses of receiving waters in lieu of site-specific criteria. The most stringent of these criteria, the chronic criterion of 87 µg/L, is based on studies conducted on waters with low pH (6.5 to 6.8 pH units) and hardness (<10 mg/L as CaCO₃) conditions not commonly observed in waters like Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek. The receiving stream has been measured to have a low hardness—typically between 32 and 51 mg/L as CaCO₃. This condition is supportive of the non-applicability of the NAWQC chronic criteria for aluminum, according to USEPA’s development document. Therefore, the acute criterion of 750 µg/L is applicable for protection of aquatic life.

The Department of Public Health establishes a secondary Maximum Contaminant Level of 200 µg/L, implemented as an annual average, for protection of human health due to long term exposure.
(b) RPA Results. The maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for aluminum was 570 µg/L. The annual quarterly average effluent concentration of aluminum was 324 ug/L. Therefore, aluminum in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the 87 ug/L.

(c) WQBELs. Due to no assimilative capacity, dilution credits are not allowed for development of the WQBELs for aluminum. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for aluminum of 77.2 µg/L and 123 µg/L, respectively, based on the NAWQC chronic criteria.

(d) Plant Performance and Attainability. Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 570 µg/L is greater than applicable WQBELs. Based on the sample results for the effluent, the limitations appear to put the Discharger in immediate non-compliance. The Discharger submitted a compliance justification on 4 March 2010. As discussed in section IV.E of this Fact Sheet, a compliance schedule has been included in this Order.

ii. Dichlorobromomethane

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

(b) RPA Results. The maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for dichlorobromomethane was 1.3 µg/L while the maximum observed upstream receiving water concentration was <1 µg/L. Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.

(c) WQBELs. Due to unknown assimilative capacity, dilution credits are not allowed for development of the WQBELs for dichlorobromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for dichlorobromomethane, as shown in Table F-5 of this Fact Sheet of 0.28 µg/L and 0.56 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.

(d) Plant Performance and Attainability. Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 1.3 µg/L is greater than applicable WQBELs. Based on the sample results for the effluent, the limitations appear to put the Discharger in immediate non-compliance. New or modified control measures may be necessary in order to comply with the effluent limitations, and the new or modified control measures cannot be designed, installed and put into operation within 30 calendar days. Furthermore, the effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane are a new regulatory
requirement within this permit, which becomes applicable to the waste discharge with the adoption of this Order, which was adopted after 1 July 2000. Therefore, a compliance time schedule for compliance with the dichlorobromomethane effluent limitations is established in TSO No. R5-2010-XXXX in accordance with CWC section 13300, that requires preparation and implementation of a pollution prevention plan in compliance with CWC section 13263.

iii. Chlorine Residual

(a) WQO. USEPA developed NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.01 µg/L and 0.02 µg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

(b) RPA Results. The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. The Discharger uses a sodium bisulfite process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek. Due to the existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC.

(c) WQBELs. The USEPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-hour) aquatic life criteria to average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations based on the variability of the existing data and the expected frequency of monitoring. However, because chlorine is an acutely toxic constituent that can and will be monitored continuously, an average 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.01 µg/L and 0.02 µg/L, respectively, based on USEPA’s NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.

(d) Plant Performance and Attainability. Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of <0.01 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Regional Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iv. 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. Changes in normal ambient pH levels
shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh waters with designated COLD or WARM beneficial uses.”

(b) RPA Results. The discharge of filter backwash water has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the Basin Plan’s numeric objectives for pH.

(c) WQBELs. 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. Analysis of the effluent data shows that Discharger can immediately comply with these pH effluent limitations.

v. Salinity – Not Applicable

vi. Settleable Solids

(a) WQO. For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states that “[w]ater shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.”

(b) RPA Results. The discharge of filter backwash water does have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the Basin Plan’s narrative objective for settleable solids. Therefore, effluent limitations for settleable solids are included in this Order.

4. WQBEL Calculations

a. This Order includes WQBELs for aluminum and dichlorobromomethane. The general methodology for calculating WQBELs based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.4.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

where:
- $\text{mult}_{AMEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL
- $\text{mult}_{MDEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL
- $MA$ = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to $LTA_{\text{acute}}$
- $MC$ = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to $LTA_{\text{chronic}}$

See Section IV.D of this Fact Sheet for a summary of Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations contained in this Order.
Table F-5. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point No. D-001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Average Monthly</th>
<th>Average Weekly</th>
<th>Maximum Daily</th>
<th>Instantaneous Minimum</th>
<th>Instantaneous Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

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

b. Acute Aquatic Toxicity. The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, “…effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate…”. USEPA Region 9 provided guidance for the development of acute toxicity effluent limitations in the absence of numeric water quality objectives for toxicity in its document titled "Guidance for NPDES Permit Issuance", dated February 1994. In section B.2. "Toxicity Requirements" (pgs. 14-15) it states that, "In the absence of specific numeric water quality objectives for acute and chronic toxicity, the narrative criterion 'no toxics in toxic amounts' applies. Achievement of the narrative criterion, as applied herein, means that ambient waters shall not demonstrate for acute toxicity: 1) less than 90% survival, 50% of the time, based on the monthly median, or 2) less than 70% survival, 10% of the time, based on any monthly median. For chronic toxicity, ambient waters shall not demonstrate a test result of greater than 1 TUC.” Accordingly, effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in this Order as follows:

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

- Minimum for any one bioassay-- ----------------------------- 70%
- Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays --------- 90%
c. Chronic Aquatic Toxicity. The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) Based on chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger from November 2008, the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

No dilution has been granted in this Order for the chronic condition. Chronic toxicity testing results exceeding 1 chronic toxicity unit (TUc) and demonstrates that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. Therefore, this Order includes a narrative chronic toxicity effluent limitation.

Numeric chronic WET effluent limitations have not been included in this Order. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region1 that contained numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petition, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, “In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits.” The process to revise the SIP is currently underway. Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limits in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the toxicity control provisions in the SIP are under revision it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. Therefore, this Order requires that the Discharger meet best management practices for compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, as allowed under 40 CFR 122.44(k).

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, the Discharger is required to conduct chronic WET testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E section V.). Furthermore, the

---

1 In the Matter of the Review of Own Motion of Waste Discharge Requirements Order Nos. R4-2002-0121 [NPDES No. CA0054011] and R4-2002-0123 [NPDES NO. CA0055119] and Time Schedule Order Nos. R4-2002-0122 and R4-2002-0124 for Los Coyotes and Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plants Issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1496 AND 1496(a)
Special Provision contained at VI.C.2.a. of this Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates a pattern of toxicity exceeding the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE workplan. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if a pattern of effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

D. Final Effluent Limitations

Table F-6. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations Discharge Point No. D-001

| Parameter                     | Units   | Effluent Limitations | Basis  \\
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Monthly</td>
<td>Maximum Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Settleable Solids</td>
<td>mL/L</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Solids</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lbs/day2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residual Chlorine</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>standard units</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable3</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane4</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.
NAWQC – Based on USEPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
PO – Based on Previous Order
BPJ – Best Professional Judgment

2 Based on a design flow of 2.0 mgd.

3 See interim limits below in Section IV.A.2.

4 See interim limits in Time Schedule Order No. R5-2010-XXXX.

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

b. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.

b. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 2.0 mgd.
1. **Mass-based Effluent Limitations**

40 CFR 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 CFR 122.45(f)(2) allows pollutants that are limited in terms of mass to additionally be limited in terms of other units of measurement. This Order includes effluent limitations expressed in terms of mass and concentration. In addition, pursuant to the exceptions to mass limitations provided in 40 CFR 122.45(f)(1), some effluent limitations are not expressed in terms of mass, such as pH and temperature, and when the applicable standards are expressed in terms of concentration (e.g., CTR criteria and MCLs) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the permitted average daily discharge flow allowed in section IV.A.1.a. of this Order.

2. **Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations**

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

3. **Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements**

All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the existing Order.

Order No, R5-2004-0144 established mass-based effluent limitations for chlorine. 40 CFR 122.45(f)(1)(ii) states that mass limitations are not required when applicable standards and limitations are expressed in terms of other units of measurement.
The numerical effluent limitations for chlorine established in this Order are based on water quality standards and objectives, which are expressed in terms of concentration. Pursuant to 40 CFR 122.45(f)(1)(ii), expressing the effluent limitations in terms of concentration is in accordance with Federal Regulations. Although the mass limitations for chlorine have been removed, this does not constitute backsliding because the flow has not increased, which is the basis for calculating mass-based effluent limitations.

4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy

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

a. Surface Water. The permitted surface water discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

b. Groundwater. The Discharger utilizes settling ponds. Wastewater contains constituents such as total dissolved solids (TDS), specific conductivity, chlorination and dechlorination byproducts, and metals. Percolation from the settling ponds may result in an increase in the concentration of these constituents in groundwater. The increase in the concentration of these constituents in groundwater must be consistent with Resolution No. 68-16. Any increase in pollutant concentrations in groundwater must be shown to be necessary to allow wastewater utility service necessary to accommodate housing and economic expansion in the area and must be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State of California. Some degradation of groundwater by the Discharger is consistent with Resolution No. 68-16 provided that:

i. the degradation is limited in extent;

ii. the degradation after effective source control, treatment, and control is limited to waste constituents typically encountered in municipal wastewater as specified in the groundwater limitations in this Order;
iii. the Discharger minimizes the degradation by fully implementing, regularly maintaining, and optimally operating best practicable treatment and control (BPTC) measures; and

iv. the degradation does not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the Basin Plan.

5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on total settleable solids and total suspended solids. The WQBELs consist of restrictions on aluminum, pH, total residual chlorine, and dichlorobromomethane. This Order’s technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order includes new effluent limitations for aluminum and dichlorobromomethane to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations

1. Compliance Schedule for aluminum. Based on the sample results for the effluent, it appears that the Discharger may be in immediate non-compliance with effluent limitations for aluminum upon issuance of the permit. New or modified control measures are necessary in order to comply with the effluent limitations, and the new or modified control measures cannot be designed, installed and put into operation within 30 calendar days. The Compliance Schedule Policy includes a provision that authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES permits for effluent limitations based on a newly interpreted water quality objective or criterion. The WQBELs for aluminum are based on a new interpretation of the narrative toxicity standard for protection of receiving water beneficial uses. Therefore, a compliance schedule for compliance with the effluent limitations for aluminum is established in the Order.

The schedule is as short as possible considering the Discharger’s intent to eliminate the surface water discharge within five years, and the need for upgraded treatment to meet the new limitations.

Interim performance-based MDELs have been established in this Order. The interim limitations were determined as described in section IV.E.3., below, and are in effect through permit expiration date. As part of the compliance schedule, this Order requires the Discharger to submit a corrective action plan and implementation schedule to assure compliance with the final effluent limitations for aluminum. In addition, the Discharger shall prepare and implement a pollution prevention plan that is in compliance with CWC section <13263.3(d)(3. The interim numeric effluent limitations and source control measures will result in the highest discharge quality that can reasonably be achieved until final compliance is attained.

2. Interim Limits for Aluminum The Compliance Schedule Policy requires the Regional Water Board to establish interim requirements and dates for their
achievement in the NPDES permit. Interim numeric effluent limitations are required for compliance schedules longer than one year. Interim limitations must be based on current treatment plant performance or existing permit limitations, whichever is more stringent.

The interim limitations for aluminum in this Order are based on the current treatment plant performance. In developing the interim limitation, where there are 10 sampling data points or more, sampling and laboratory variability is accounted for by establishing interim limits that are based on normally distributed data where 99.9% of the data points will lie within 3.3 standard deviations of the mean (Basic Statistical Methods for Engineers and Scientists, Kennedy and Neville, Harper and Row). Therefore, the interim limitations in this Order are established as the mean plus 3.3 standard deviations of the available data.

When there are less than 10 sampling data points available, the EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control (EPA/505/2-90-001), TSD) recommends a coefficient of variation of 0.6 be utilized as representative of wastewater effluent sampling. The TSD recognizes that a minimum of 10 data points is necessary to conduct a valid statistical analysis. The multipliers contained in Table 5-2 of the TSD are used to determine a maximum daily limitation based on a long-term average objective. In this case, the long-term average objective is to maintain, at a minimum, the current plant performance level. Therefore, when there are less than 10 sampling points for a constituent, interim limitations are based on 3.11 times the maximum observed effluent concentration to obtain the daily maximum interim limitation (TSD, Table 5 2).

The Regional Water Board finds that the Discharger can undertake source control and treatment plant measures to maintain compliance with the interim limitations included in this Order. Interim limitations are established when compliance with final effluent limitations cannot be achieved by the existing discharge. Discharge of constituents in concentrations in excess of the final effluent limitations, but in compliance with the interim effluent limitations, can significantly degrade water quality and adversely affect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream on a long-term basis. The interim limitations, however, establish an enforceable ceiling concentration until compliance with the effluent limitation can be achieved.

The following table summarizes the calculations of the interim effluent limitations for aluminum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Maximum Effluent Concentration</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Number of Samples</th>
<th>Interim Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aluminum</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-7. Interim Effluent Limitation Calculation Summary
F. Settling/Drying Pond Specifications

7. The discharge of waste classified as "hazardous" as defined in section 2521(a) of Title 23, CCR, or "designated", as defined in section 13173 of the CWC, to the settling pond is prohibited.

8. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.

9. The settling pond shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes, in particular,
   c. An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface;
   d. Weeds shall be minimized.

10. Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.

11. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger).

12. The freeboard in the settling pond shall never be less than two feet as measured from the water surface to the lowest point of overflow.

G. Reclamation Specifications- Not Applicable

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

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

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

B. Groundwater

1. The beneficial uses of the underlying ground water are municipal and domestic supply, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, and agricultural supply.

VI. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

40 CFR 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) of this Order, establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Facility.

A. Influent Monitoring - Influent weir water monitoring (INF-001) is considered equivalent to influent monitoring

B. Effluent Monitoring

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

2. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow, pH, turbidity, total residual chlorine, settleable solids, suspended solids, total recoverable aluminum, hardness, trihalomethanes, acute and chronic toxicity, and CTR priority pollutants have been retained from Order No. R5-2004-0144 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters.
3. Effluent monitoring requirements for aluminum and dichlorobromomethane have been increased from quarterly to monthly.

4. New monitoring requirements are included for electrical conductivity.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

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

2. **Chronic Toxicity.** One test shall be performed once during the permit cycle. Chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring

1. **Surface Water**
   a. Receiving water monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.
   b. New monitoring requirements are included for electrical conductivity, aluminum and dichlorobromomethane.

2. **Groundwater**
   a. This Order requires the Discharger to perform a groundwater monitoring well feasibility study. Based on the results of the study, the Order may be reopened to include groundwater monitoring.

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. **Biosolids Monitoring**

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

VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. **Standard Provisions**

   Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 CFR 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under 40 CFR 122.42.
40 CFR 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) 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. 40 CFR 123.25(a)(12) allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 CFR 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 CFR 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the CWC is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference CWC section 13387(e).

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

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

   b. Pollution Prevention. This Order requires the Discharger prepare pollution prevention plans following CWC section 13263.3(d)(3) for aluminum and dichlorobromomethane. This reopener provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements for these constituents based on a review of the pollution prevention plans.

   c. Whole Effluent Toxicity. This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE). This Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation based on that objective.

   d. Constituent Study. There are indications that the discharge may contain constituents that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives. This Order requires the Discharger to complete a study of these constituents' potential effect in the receiving water. This reopener provision allows the Regional Water Board to reopen this Order for addition of effluent limitations and requirements for these constituents if after review of the study results it is determined that the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality objective.

   e. Salinity/EC Site-Specific Study. This Order requires the Discharger to complete and submit a report on the results of salinity/EC site-specific studies to determine appropriate salinity/EC levels necessary to protect downstream
beneficial uses. The studies shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board as specified in section VI.C.2.d. of this Order. Based on a review of the results of the report on the salinity/EC site-specific studies this Order may be reopened for addition of an effluent limitation and requirements for salinity and/or EC.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements. The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00). Based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from 15 October 2004 through 19 November 2008, the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

This provision requires the Discharger to develop a TRE Workplan in accordance with USEPA guidance. In addition, the provision provides a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger and requirements for accelerated monitoring, as well as, requirements for TRE initiation if a pattern of toxicity has been demonstrated.

Monitoring Trigger. A numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of > 1 TUc (where TUc = 100/NOEC) is applied in the provision, because this Order does not allow any dilution for the chronic condition. Therefore, a TRE is triggered when the effluent exhibits a pattern of toxicity at 100% effluent.

Accelerated Monitoring. The provision requires accelerated WET testing when a regular WET test result exceeds the monitoring trigger. The purpose of accelerated monitoring is to determine, in an expedient manner, whether toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present before requiring the implementation of a TRE.

The provision requires accelerated monitoring consisting of four chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e., one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. Due to possible seasonality of the toxicity, the accelerated monitoring should be performed in a timely manner, preferably taking no more than 2 to 3 months to complete. Guidance regarding accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation is provided in the Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991 (TSD). The TSD at page 118 states, “EPA recommends if toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present at levels above effluent limits more than 20 percent of the time, a TRE should be required.” Therefore, four accelerated monitoring tests are required in this provision. If no toxicity is demonstrated in the four accelerated tests, then it demonstrates that toxicity is not present at levels above the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time (only 1 of 5 tests are toxic, including the initial test). However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity (i.e. toxicity present exceeding...
the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time), the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

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

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

Figure F-1
WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart

Re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 14-days from notification of test failure
i. **Constituent Study.** There are indications that the discharge may contain constituents that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives. This Order requires the Discharger to complete a study of these constituents’ potential effect in the receiving water. If after a review of the study results it is determined that the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality objective this Order may be reopened and effluent limitations added for the subject constituents.

ii. **Salinity/EC Site-Specific Studies.** This Order requires the Discharger to prepare and submit a report on the results of salinity/EC site-specific studies to determine appropriate salinity/EC levels necessary to protect downstream beneficial uses. The study shall determine local drinking water intakes. Based on these factors, the study shall recommend site-specific numeric values for salinity/EC that fully protect the agricultural irrigation use designation of Magalia Reservoir/ Little Butte Creek, a water of the United States, and a tributary to Butte Creek. The Regional Water Board will evaluate the recommendations, select appropriate values, reevaluate reasonable potential for salinity/EC, and reopen the permit, as necessary, to include appropriate effluent limitations for these constituents. The study shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board within two (2) years of the effective date of this order.

iii. **Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Study.** An effluent and receiving water monitoring study is required to ensure adequate information is available for the next permit renewal. Twice during the permit cycle, the Discharger is required to conduct monitoring of the effluent at EFF-001/EFF-002 and of the receiving water at RSW-001 for all priority pollutants and other constituents of concern as described in Attachment I. Dioxin and furan sampling shall be performed twice during permit cycle, as described in Attachment J.

3. **Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

   a. **CWC Section 13263.3(d)(2) Pollution Prevention Plans.** A pollution prevention plan for aluminum is required in this Order per CWC section 13263.3(d)(1)(C). The pollution prevention plans required in section VI.C.3 and in section VI.C.7 of this Order, shall, at a minimum, meet the requirements outlined in CWC section 13263.3(d)(2). The minimum requirements for the pollution prevention plans include the following:

   i. An analysis of one or more of the pollutants, as directed by the State Water Board, a Regional Water Board, or a POTW, that the Facility discharges into water or introduces into POTWs, a description of the sources of pollutants, and a comprehensive review of the processes used by the Discharger that result in the generation and discharge of the pollutants.
ii. An analysis of the potential for pollution prevention to reduce the generation of the pollutants, including the application of innovative and alternative technologies and any adverse environmental impacts resulting from the use of these methods.

iii. A detailed description of the tasks and time schedules required to investigate and implement various elements of pollution prevention techniques.

iv. A statement of the Discharger’s pollution prevention goals and strategies, including priorities for short-term and long-term action.

v. A description of the Discharger’s existing pollution prevention methods.

vi. A statement that the Discharger’s existing and planned pollution prevention strategies do not constitute cross-media pollution transfers unless clear environmental benefits of such an approach are identified to the satisfaction of the State Water Board, the Regional Water Board, or the POTW, and information that supports that statement.

vii. Proof of compliance with the Hazardous Waste Source Reduction and Management Review Act of 1989 [Article 11.9 (commencing with section 25244.12) of Chapter 6.5 of Division 20 of the Health and Safety Code) if the Discharger is also subject to that act.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

a. Settling/Drying Pond Operating Requirements.

i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.

ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.

iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,

iv. An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.

v. Weeds shall be minimized.

vi. Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.

vii. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
viii. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary inflow and infiltration during the non-irrigation season. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).

ix. Freeboard in the emergency storage ponds shall not be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow), except if lesser freeboard does not threaten the integrity of the pond, no overflow of the pond occurs, and lesser freeboard is due to direct precipitation or storm water runoff occurring as a result of annual precipitation with greater than a 100-year recurrence interval, or a storm event with an intensity greater than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.

x. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with the operating specification contained at section vii above.

xi. The monthly average discharge flow shall not exceed 2.0 mgd.

xii. The discharge of waste classified as “hazardous” as defined in section 2521(a) of Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), or “designated”, as defined in section 13173 of the CWC, to the treatment ponds is prohibited.

xiii. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger).

xiv. Ponds shall not have a pH less than 6.5 or greater than 8.5.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) – Not Applicable

6. Other Special Provisions

a. Ownership Change. To maintain the accountability of the operation of the Facility, the Discharger is required to notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter if, and when, there is any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger.

b. Sludge/Biosolids Discharge Specifications

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

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

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

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

c. Biosolids Disposal Requirements

i. The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program for biosolids disposal contained in Attachment E.

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

iii. The Discharger is encouraged to comply with the “Manual of Good Practice for Agricultural Land Application of Biosolids” developed by the California Water Environment Association.

d. Biosolids Storage Requirements

i. Facilities for the storage of Class B biosolids shall be located, designed and maintained to restrict public access to biosolids.
ii. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed and maintained to prevent washout or inundation from a storm or flood with a return frequency of 100 years.

iii. Biosolids storage facilities, which contain biosolids, shall be designed and maintained to contain all storm water falling on the biosolids storage area during a rainfall year with a return frequency of 100 years.

iv. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed, maintained and operated to minimize the generation of leachate.

7. Compliance Schedules

The Discharger cannot immediately comply with the new effluent limitations for aluminum. The new aluminum limitations are considered a 'new interpretation' of a narrative water quality objective; therefore, since this is the first time an effluent limit for aluminum has been applied to the Discharger, this Order establishes a compliance schedule for the new, final, WQBELs for aluminum and requires full compliance by permit expiration.

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Regional Water Board is considering the issuance of WDRs that will serve as an NPDES permit for the Facility. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Regional Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs. The Regional Water Board encourages public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the physical posting (posting at city offices, county courthouse or city hall, local newspaper), and internet posting.

B. Written Comments

The staff determinations are tentative. Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning these tentative WDRs. Comments must be submitted either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Regional Water Board at the address above on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, written comments must be received at the Regional Water Board offices by 5:00 p.m. on <DATE>. 
C. Public Hearing

The Regional Water Board will hold a public hearing on the tentative WDRs during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: 26, 27, 28 May 2010
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 are invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Regional Water Board will hear testimony, if any, pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. Oral testimony will be heard; however, for accuracy of the record, important testimony should be in writing.

Please be aware that dates and venues may change. Our Web address is www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley where you can access the current agenda for changes in dates and locations.

D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Regional Water Board regarding the final WDRs. The petition must be submitted within 30 days of the Regional Water Board’s action to the following address:

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

E. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge, related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special provisions, comments received, and other information 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 Regional Water Board by calling (530) 224-4845.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional 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 Ron S. Falkowski at 530-224-3227.
## ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>MEC</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>CMC</th>
<th>CCC</th>
<th>Water &amp; Org</th>
<th>Org. Only</th>
<th>Basin Plan</th>
<th>MCL</th>
<th>Reasonable Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum, Total Recoverable µg/L</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>87(^2,3)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane µg/L</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Note: All inorganic concentrations are given as a total recoverable.

MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration

B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect

C = Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)

Water & Org = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)

Org. Only = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)

Basin Plan = Numeric Site-specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective

MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level

NA = Not Available

ND = Non-detect

Footnotes:

1. USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 1-hour Average

2. USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 4-day Average.

3. The chronic criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life of 87 µg/L may not be applicable because receiving water conditions are not similar to those under which the criterion was developed. The discharge does exhibit reasonable potential to exceed the acute criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life and the secondary MCL for aluminum.
## ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Most Stringent Criteria</th>
<th>Dilution Factors</th>
<th>Aquatic Life Calculations</th>
<th>Final Effluent Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorobromo methane</td>
<td>ug/L</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT I – EFFLUENT AND RECEIVING WATER CHARACTERIZATION STUDY

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

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

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

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

D. Dioxin and furan sampling. Section 3 of the SIP has specific requirements for the collection of samples for analysis of dioxin and furan congeners, which are detailed in Attachment J. Pursuant to Section 13267 of the California Water Code, this Order includes a requirement for the Discharger to submit monitoring data for the effluent and receiving water as described in Attachment J.

II. Monitoring Requirements.

A. Twice during the Life of the Permit Monitoring. Twice during the life of the permit priority pollutant samples shall be collected from the effluent and upstream receiving water (EFF-001/EFF-002 and RSW-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table I-1. The results of such monitoring be submitted to the Regional Water Board, prior to 180 days before permit expiration. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.

B. Once during the Life of the Permit Monitoring (dioxins and furans only). Once during the life of the permit monitoring is required for dioxins and furans, as specified in
Attachment J. The results of dioxin and furan monitoring shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board with the quarterly priority data at the completion of the Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Study, and during the fourth year of the permit term.

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

D. **Sample type.** All effluent samples shall be taken as grab samples. All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples.

### Table I-1. Priority Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Criterion Concentration Limit ug/L or noted</th>
<th>Suggested Test Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLATILE ORGANICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,1-Dichloroethane</td>
<td>75343</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,1-Dichloroethene</td>
<td>75354</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,1,1-Trichloroethane</td>
<td>71556</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,1,2-Trichloroethane</td>
<td>79005</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane</td>
<td>79345</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,2-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>95501</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,2-Dichloroethane</td>
<td>107062</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,2-Dichloroethene</td>
<td>156592</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene</td>
<td>120821</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,3-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>54173</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,3-Dichloropropene</td>
<td>542756</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,4-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>106467</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Acrolein</td>
<td>107028</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Acrylonitrite</td>
<td>107131</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>71432</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bromoform</td>
<td>75252</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bromomethane</td>
<td>74839</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Carbon tetrachloride</td>
<td>56235</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chlorobenzene (mono chlorobenzene)</td>
<td>108907</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Chloroethane</td>
<td>75003</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2- Chloroethyl vinyl ether</td>
<td>110758</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>122 (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chloroform</td>
<td>67663</td>
<td>OEHHA Cancer Risk</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chloromethane</td>
<td>74873</td>
<td>USEPA Health Advisory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dibromochloromethane</td>
<td>124481</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR #</td>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>CAS Number</td>
<td>Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters</td>
<td>Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted¹</td>
<td>Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted</td>
<td>Suggested Test Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dichlorobromomethane</td>
<td>75274</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dichloromethane</td>
<td>75092</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>100414</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Hexachlorobenzene</td>
<td>118741</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00075</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Hexachlorobutadiene</td>
<td>87683</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Hexachloroethane</td>
<td>67721</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Naphthalene</td>
<td>91203</td>
<td>USEPA IRIS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tetrachloroethene</td>
<td>127184</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>108883</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene</td>
<td>156605</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Trichloroethene</td>
<td>79016</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Vinyl chloride</td>
<td>75014</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)</td>
<td>1634044</td>
<td>Secondary MCL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trichlorofluoromethane</td>
<td>75694</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-</td>
<td>76131</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trifluoroethane¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Styrene</td>
<td>100425</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xylenes</td>
<td>1330207</td>
<td>Taste &amp; Odor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters</th>
<th>Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted¹</th>
<th>Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted</th>
<th>Suggested Test Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,2-Benzanthracene</td>
<td>56553</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,2-Diphenyldrazine</td>
<td>122667</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2-Chlorophenol</td>
<td>95578</td>
<td>Taste and Odor</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2,4-Dichlorophenol</td>
<td>120832</td>
<td>Taste and Odor</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,4-Dimethylphenol</td>
<td>105679</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,4-Dinitrophenol</td>
<td>51285</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2,4-Dinitrotoluene</td>
<td>121142</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2,4,6-Trichlorotoluene</td>
<td>88062</td>
<td>Taste and Odor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2,6-Dinitrotoluene</td>
<td>606202</td>
<td>USEPA IRIS</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2-Nitrophenol</td>
<td>25154557</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>150 (5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2-Chloronaphthalene</td>
<td>91587</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>1600 (6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3,3’-Dichlorobenzidine</td>
<td>91941</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3,4-Benzofluoranthene</td>
<td>205992</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4-Chloro-3-methylphenol</td>
<td>59507</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol</td>
<td>534521</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4-Nitrophenol</td>
<td>100027</td>
<td>USEPA Health Advisory</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether</td>
<td>101553</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether</td>
<td>7005723</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>122 (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters</th>
<th>Suggested Test Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Acenaphthene</td>
<td>83329</td>
<td>Taste and Odor</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 20 ug/L or noted¹</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Acenaphthylene</td>
<td>208968</td>
<td>No Criteria Available</td>
<td>Quantitation Limit 10 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Anthracene</td>
<td>120127</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 9,600 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Benzidine</td>
<td>92875</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.00012 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)</td>
<td>50328</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.0044 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Benzo(g,h,i)perylene</td>
<td>191242</td>
<td>No Criteria Available</td>
<td>Quantitation Limit 5 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Benzo(k)fluoranthene</td>
<td>207089</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.0044 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane</td>
<td>111911</td>
<td>No Criteria Available</td>
<td>Quantitation Limit 5 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether</td>
<td>111444</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.031 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether</td>
<td>39638329</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 122 (3) ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate</td>
<td>117817</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 1.8 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Butyl benzyl phthalate</td>
<td>85687</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 3 (7) ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Chrysene</td>
<td>218019</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.0044 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Di-n-butylphthalate</td>
<td>84742</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 3 (7) ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Di-n-octylphthalate</td>
<td>117840</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 3 (7) ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene</td>
<td>53703</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.0044 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Diethyl phthalate</td>
<td>84662</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 3 (7) ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dimethyl phthalate</td>
<td>131113</td>
<td>Aquatic Toxicity</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 3 (7) ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Fluoranthene</td>
<td>206440</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 300 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Fluorene</td>
<td>86737</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 1300 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Hexachlorocyclopentadiene</td>
<td>77474</td>
<td>Taste and Odor</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 1 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene</td>
<td>193395</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.0044 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Isophorone</td>
<td>78591</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 8.4 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>N-Nitrosodiphenylamine</td>
<td>86306</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 5 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>N-Nitrosodimethylamine</td>
<td>62759</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.00069 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine</td>
<td>621647</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.005 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Nitrobenzene</td>
<td>98953</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 17 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Pentachlorophenol</td>
<td>87865</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.28 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Phenanthrene</td>
<td>85018</td>
<td>No Criteria Available</td>
<td>Quantitation Limit 5 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Phenol</td>
<td>108952</td>
<td>Taste and Odor</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 5 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pyrene</td>
<td>129000</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 960 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INORGANICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters</th>
<th>Suggested Test Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>7429905</td>
<td>Ambient Water Quality</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 87 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Antimony</td>
<td>7440360</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 6 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arsenic</td>
<td>7440382</td>
<td>Ambient Water Quality</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.018 ug/L or noted</td>
<td>EPA 1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>1332214</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule/Primary MCL</td>
<td>Concentration Limit 0.2 MFL &gt;10um</td>
<td>EPA/600/R-93/116(PCM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Attachment I – Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Study**
### Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted¹</th>
<th>Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted</th>
<th>Suggested Test Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barium</td>
<td>7440393</td>
<td>Basin Plan Objective</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beryllium</td>
<td>7440417</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cadmium</td>
<td>7440439</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>EPA 1638/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Chromium (total)</td>
<td>7440473</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Chromium (VI)</td>
<td>18540299</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 7199/1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>7440508</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>4.1 (2)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cyanide</td>
<td>57125</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 9012A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fluoride</td>
<td>7782414</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>EPA 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>7439921</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.92 (2)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>7439976</td>
<td>TMDL Development</td>
<td>0.0002 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA 1669/1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nickel</td>
<td>7440020</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>24 (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td>7782492</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>5 (8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>7440224</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.71 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thallium</td>
<td>7440280</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Manganese</td>
<td>7439965</td>
<td>Secondary MCL/ Basin Plan Objective</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>7440666</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule/ Basin Plan Objective</td>
<td>54/ 16 (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 6020/200.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PESTICIDES - PCBs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Criterion Concentration ug/L or noted¹</th>
<th>Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted</th>
<th>Suggested Test Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>4,4'-DDD</td>
<td>72548</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00083</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>4,4'-DDE</td>
<td>72559</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00059</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>4,4'-DDT</td>
<td>50293</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00059</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>alpha-Endosulfan</td>
<td>959988</td>
<td>National Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.056 (9)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)</td>
<td>319846</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Alachlor</td>
<td>15972608</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>beta-Endosulfan</td>
<td>33213659</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.056 (9)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane</td>
<td>319857</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Chlordane</td>
<td>57749</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00057</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane</td>
<td>319868</td>
<td>No Criteria Available</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Dieldrin</td>
<td>60571</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00014</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Endosulfan sulfate</td>
<td>1031078</td>
<td>Ambient Water Quality</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Endrin</td>
<td>72208</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Endrin Aldehyde</td>
<td>7421934</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Heptachlor</td>
<td>76448</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00021</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTR #</td>
<td>Constituent</td>
<td>CAS Number</td>
<td>Basis</td>
<td>Criterion Concentration</td>
<td>Criterion Quantitation Limit</td>
<td>Suggested Test Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Heptachlor Epoxide</td>
<td>1024573</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)</td>
<td>58899</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>PCB-1016</td>
<td>12674112</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00017 (10)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>PCB-1221</td>
<td>11104282</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00017 (10)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>PCB-1232</td>
<td>11141165</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00017 (10)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>PCB-1242</td>
<td>53469219</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00017 (10)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>PCB-1248</td>
<td>12672296</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00017 (10)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>PCB-1254</td>
<td>11097691</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00017 (10)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>PCB-1260</td>
<td>11096825</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.00017 (10)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Toxaphene</td>
<td>8001352</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atrazine</td>
<td>1912249</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8141A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Bentazon</td>
<td>25057890</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 643/515.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Carbofuran</td>
<td>1563662</td>
<td>CDFG Hazard Assess.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4-D</td>
<td></td>
<td>94757</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8151A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Dalapon</td>
<td>75990</td>
<td>Ambient Water Quality</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8151A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)</td>
<td>96128</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>EPA 8260B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate</td>
<td>103231</td>
<td>USEPA IRIS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EPA 8270C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Diquat</td>
<td>88857</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 8151A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Endothal</td>
<td>145733</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>EPA 548.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Ethylene Dibromide</td>
<td>106934</td>
<td>OEHHA Cancer Risk</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>EPA 8260B/504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Glyphosate</td>
<td>1071836</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>HPLC/EPA 547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Methoxychlor</td>
<td>72435</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EPA 8081A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Molinate (Ordam)</td>
<td>2212671</td>
<td>CDFG Hazard Assess.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPA 634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Oxamyl</td>
<td>23135220</td>
<td>Public Health Goal</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EPA 8318/632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Picloram</td>
<td>1918021</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8151A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Simazine (Princep)</td>
<td>122349</td>
<td>USEPA IRIS</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8141A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Thiobencarb</td>
<td>28249776</td>
<td>Basin Plan Objective/ Secondary MCL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>HPLC/EPA 639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)</td>
<td>1746016</td>
<td>Calif. Toxics Rule</td>
<td>1.30E-08</td>
<td>5.00E-06</td>
<td>EPA 8290 (HRGC) MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,4,5-TP (Silvex)</td>
<td>93765</td>
<td>Ambient Water Quality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8151A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Diazinon</td>
<td>333415</td>
<td>CDFG Hazard Assess.</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>EPA 8141A/GCMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chlorpyrifos</td>
<td>2921882</td>
<td>CDFG Hazard Assess.</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPA 8141A/GCMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER CONSTITUENTS**

- Ammonia (as N) | 7664417 | Ambient Water Quality | 1500 (4) | EPA 350.1
- Chloride | 16887006 | Agricultural Use | 106,000 | EPA 300.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTR #</th>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>Controlling Water Quality Criterion for Surface Waters</th>
<th>Criterion Concentration Limit ug/L or noted¹</th>
<th>Criterion Quantitation Limit ug/L or noted¹</th>
<th>Suggested Test Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardness (as CaCO₃)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 CFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foaming Agents (MBAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary MCL</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>SM5540C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitrate (as N)</td>
<td>14797558</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>EPA 300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitrite (as N)</td>
<td>14797650</td>
<td>Primary MCL</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>EPA 300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basin Plan Objective</td>
<td>6.5-8.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>EPA 150.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phosphorus, Total (as P)</td>
<td>7723140</td>
<td>USEPA IRIS</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA 365.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific conductance (EC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Use</td>
<td>700 umhos/cm</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA 120.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary MCL</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>EPA 300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulfide (as S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taste and Odor</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA 376.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulfite (as SO₃)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Criteria Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SM4500-SO3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basin Plan Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>°F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Disolved Solids (TDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Use</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA 160.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOOTNOTES:**

1. The Criterion Concentrations serve only as a point of reference for the selection of the appropriate analytical method. They do not indicate a regulatory decision that the cited concentration is either necessary or sufficient for full protection of beneficial uses. Available technology may require that effluent limits be set lower than these values.

2. Freshwater aquatic life criteria for metals are expressed as a function of total hardness (mg/L) in the water body. Values displayed correspond to a total hardness of 40 mg/L.

3. For haloethers

4. For nitrophenols.

5. For phthalate esters.

6. For chlorinated naphthalenes.

7. For phthalate esters.


10. Criteria for sum of all PCBs.

11. Mercury monitoring shall utilize "ultra-clean" sampling and analytical methods. These methods include:

   - Method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at USEPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, USEPA;
   - Method 1631: Mercury in Water by Oxidation, Purge and Trap, and Cold Vapor Atomic Fluorescence, USEPA.

**III. Additional Study Requirements**

**A. Laboratory Requirements.** The laboratory analyzing the monitoring samples shall be certified by the Department of Health Services in accordance with the provisions of Water Code 13176 and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports (ELAP certified). In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger, analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual
containing the steps followed in this program must be kept in the laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Regional Water Board staff. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Regional Water Board.

B. Criterion Quantitation Limit (CQL). The criterion quantitation limits will be equal to or lower than the minimum levels (MLs) in Appendix 4 of the SIP or the detection limits for purposes of reporting (DLRs) below the controlling water quality criterion concentrations summarized in Table I-1 of this Order. In cases where the controlling water quality criteria concentrations are below the detection limits of all approved analytical methods, the best available procedure will be utilized that meets the lowest of the MLs and DLR. Table I-1 contains suggested analytical procedures. The Discharger is not required to use these specific procedures as long as the procedure selected achieves the desired minimum detection level.

C. Method Detection Limit (MDL). The method detection limit for the laboratory shall be determined by the procedure found in 40 CFR Part 136, Appendix B (revised as of May 14, 1999).

D. Reporting Limit (RL). The reporting limit for the laboratory. This is the lowest quantifiable concentration that the laboratory can determine. Ideally, the RL should be equal to or lower than the CQL to meet the purposes of this monitoring.

E. Reporting Protocols. The results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample shall use the following reporting protocols:

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

2. Sample results less than the reported 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.

3. For the purposes of data collection, the laboratory shall write the estimated chemical concentration next to DNQ as well as the words “Estimated Concentration” (may shortened to “Est. Conc.”). The laboratory, if such information is available, may include numerical estimates of the data quantity for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy (+ or – a percentage of the reported value), numerical ranges (low and high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.

4. Sample results that are less than the laboratory’s MDL shall be reported as “Not Detected” or ND.
F. Data Format. The monitoring report shall contain the following information for each pollutant:

1. The name of the constituent.
2. Sampling location.
3. The date the sample was collected.
4. The time the sample was collected.
5. The date the sample was analyzed. For organic analyses, the extraction data will also be indicated to assure that hold times are not exceeded for prepared samples.
6. The analytical method utilized.
7. The measured or estimated concentration.
8. The required Criterion Quantitation Limit (CQL).
10. The laboratory’s lowest reporting limit (RL).
11. Any additional comments.
ATTACHMENT J – DIOXIN AND FURAN SAMPLING

The CTR includes criteria for 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD). In addition to this compound, there are many congeners of chlorinated dibenzodioxins (2,3,7,8-CDDs) and chlorinated dibenzofurans (2,3,7,8-CDFs) that exhibit toxic effects similar to those of 2,3,7,8-TCDD. The USEPA has published toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for 17 of the congeners. The TEFs express the relative toxicities of the congeners compared to 2,3,7,8-TCDD (whose TEF equals 1.0). In June 1997, participants in a World Health Organization (WHO) expert meeting revised TEF values for 1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDD, OctaCDD, and OctaCDF. The current TEFs for the 17 congeners, which include the three revised values, are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congener</th>
<th>TEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,3,7,8-TetraCDD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDD</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDD</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDD</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDD</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDD</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OctaCDD</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,3,7,8-TetraCDF</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,7,8-PentaCDF</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,3,4,7,8-PentaCDF</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,4,7,8-HexaCDF</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,6,7,8-HexaCDF</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,7,8,9-HexaCDF</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,3,4,6,7,8-HexaCDF</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HeptaCDF</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HeptaCDF</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OctaCDF</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Discharger shall conduct effluent and receiving water monitoring for the 2,3,7,8-TCDD congeners listed above to assess the presence and amounts of the congeners being discharged and already present in the receiving water. Effluent and upstream receiving water shall be monitored for the presence of the 17 congeners once during dry weather and once during wet weather for 1 year within the term of the study.

The Discharger shall report, for each congener, the analytical results of the effluent and receiving water monitoring, including the quantifiable limit and the method detection limit, and the measured or estimated concentration.

In addition, the Discharger shall multiply each measured or estimated congener concentration by its respective TEF value and report the sum of these values.