

**Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Central Valley Region  
Board Meeting – 8/9 June 2017**

**Response to Written Comments for  
Monarch Nut Company, LCC and Land Application Area Owners  
Pistachio and Blueberry Processing Facility  
Tulare County  
Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements**

---

At a public hearing scheduled for 8/9 June 2017, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (Central Valley Water Board) will consider adoption of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for Monarch Nut Company. This document contains responses to written comments received on 25 April 2017 from interested parties regarding the tentative WDRs. Written comments from interested parties were required by public notice to be received by the Central Valley Water Board by 5:00 pm on 27 April 2017 to receive full consideration. Comments were received from the Discharger.

Written comments from the Discharger are summarized below, followed by the responses of Central Valley Water Board staff. Based on the comments, Central Valley Water Board staff did make some changes to the tentative WDRs.

---

**MONARCH NUT COMPANY, COMMENTS**

---

On 25 April 2017, Dave Norman from Provost & Pritchard, Monarch Nut's consultant, submitted written comments via email to correct factual errors in the tentative WDRs and request a change in the monitoring and reporting requirements.

**Comment No. 1:** Page 4 Finding 8: Should read: "In 2014 the discharge began to convert to a dry-hulling process...."

**Response:** Finding 8 in the WDRs has been revised as requested.

**Comment No. 2:** Monitoring and Reporting Program Order R5-2017-XXXX page 3: Wastewater Lagoon Monitoring; Freeboard Units and precision: request change from 0.1 feet to 0.5 feet.

**Response:** The 0.1 foot requirement is a standard requirement that dischargers in the Central Valley region are required to meet. No changes to the Monitoring and Reporting Program have been made.

**Comment No. 3:** Page 6: Table, Row 3 Infusion Plant. Under Wastewater Column, Change: "Vault 5" to "Vault 4".

**Response:** The table on Page 6 has been corrected as requested.

**Comment No. 4:** Page 8 Finding 22 change: "Pond 2" to "Pond 4".

**Response:** Finding 22 has been corrected as requested.

**Comment No. 5:** Page 23 Finding B .1. The values here are correct but inconsistent with the Information Sheet page 2 “Flow and Effluent Limitations”. Correct Information Sheet to read “... 98 million gallons, with a maximum of 1.5 million gallons per day”.

**Response:** The flow and effluent limitations presented in the Information Sheet have been corrected to read “...98 million gallons, with a maximum of 1.5 million gallons per day”.

**Comment No. 6:** Attachment F: Storm Water Flow Schematic. Pond 2 (unlined) should be changed to Pond 4 (unlined).

**Response:** Attachment F, Storm Water Flow Schematic has been corrected to refer to Pond 4.

**Comment No. 2:** Page 20 Finding 73. Wording inaccurate; Modify to address:

1. The current IGP is the 2014-0057-DWQ not the 97-03-DWQ.
2. The facility was not covered under the 97-03-DWQ – confirmed with the SWRCB via email 4/5/17. As stated in Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements storm water does not discharge off site, therefore, neither an NOI or other submittals are necessary.

**Response:** The text in Finding 20 has been corrected and clarified and now states, “The State Water Board adopted Order 2014-0057-DWQ (NPDES General Permit CAS000001) specifying waste discharge requirements for discharges of storm water associated with industrial activities, and requiring submittal of a Notice of Intent by all affected industrial discharges. All storm water from the facility is allowed to percolate on-site and does not discharge into water of the United States. The Discharger is therefore not required to obtain coverage under the NPDES General Permit CAS000001.”