

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
LOS ANGELES REGION
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles**

FACT SHEET

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
(Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant)**

NPDES No. CA0054011
Public Notice No.: R4-2002-0021

FACILITY ADDRESS

Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant

16515 Piuma Avenue
Cerritos, CA 90703

FACILITY MAILING ADDRESS

County Sanitation Districts of Los
Angeles County

1955 Workman Mill Road
Whittier, CA 90601

Contact: Victoria Conway
Telephone: (562) 699-7411

I. Public Participation

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Regional Board) is considering the issuance of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the above-referenced facility. As an initial step in the WDR process, the Regional Board staff has developed tentative WDRs. The Regional Board encourages public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Written Comments

The staff determinations are tentative. Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning these tentative WDRs. Comments should be submitted either in person or by mail to:

Executive Officer
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Los Angeles Region
320 West 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Board, written comments should be received at the Regional Board offices by 5:00 p.m. on May 2, 2002.

The discharger submitted comments to the RWQCB based on previous tentative permits mailed to them. However, previous tentative permits contained limits been based on the United States Environmental Protection

April 8, 2002

Revised: July 11, 2002

Agency's (USEPA) Technical Support Document. The Regional Board staff has incorporated some of the discharger's suggestions into this tentative.

B. Public Hearing

The Regional 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: July 11, 2002
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Location: Simi Valley

Interested persons are invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Regional 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.

C. Waste Discharge Requirements Appeals

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

State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812

D. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD), related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special conditions, comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at 320 West 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, California 90013, at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Los Angeles Regional Board by calling (213) 576-6600.

E. 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 Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

II. PURPOSE OF ORDER

County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (hereinafter CSDLAC or Discharger) discharge tertiary-treated wastewater, from its Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (Los Coyotes WRP) located in Cerritos, to the San Gabriel River, a water of the State and the United States. The discharge is regulated under waste discharge requirements contained in Order No. 95-077, adopted by

this Regional Board on June 12, 1995. Order No. 95-077 also serves as the permit under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES No. CA0054011). Order No. 95-077 has an expiration date of May 10, 2000.

Section 122.6 of Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR) and section 2235.4 of Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) state that an expired permit continue in force until the effective date of a new permit provided the permittee has timely submitted a complete application for a new permit. . On November 15, 1999, CSDLAC timely filed a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) and applied to the Regional Board for reissuance of waste discharge requirements (WDR) and NPDES permit to discharge tertiary treated wastewater. Therefore, the Discharger's permit has been administratively extended until the Regional Board acts on the new WDR and permit.

The accompanying Order is the reissuance of waste discharge requirements and NPDES permit for the Los Coyotes WRP.

III. FACILITY AND TREATMENT PROCESS DESCRIPTION

CSDLAC own and operate the Los Coyotes Water Reclamation Plant (Los Coyotes WRP), a tertiary wastewater treatment plant located at 16515 Piuma Avenue, Cerritos, California. Attachment 1 shows the location of the plant. The Los Coyotes WRP currently receives wastewater from Alhambra, Arcadia, Artesia, Baldwin Park, Bellflower, Cerritos, City of Industry, El Monte, Glendale, Irwindale, La Cañada Flintridge, La Habra Heights, La Mirada, Monrovia, Montebello, Monterey Park, Norwalk, Pasadena, Pico Rivera, Rosemead, San Gabriel, San Marino, Santa Fe Springs, South El Monte, South Pasadena, Temple City, and Whittier. The wastewater is a mixture of domestic and industrial wastewater that is pre-treated pursuant to 40 CFR Part 403.

The Los Coyotes WRP is part of CSDLAC's integrated network of facilities, known as the Joint Outfall System, which includes seven treatment plants. The upstream treatment plants (Whittier Narrows, Pomona, La Cañada, Long Beach, Los Coyotes, and San Jose Creek) are connected to the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) located in Carson. This system allows for the diversion of influent flows into or around each upstream plant if so desired.

As reported in the ROWD, the Los Coyotes WRP has a design capacity of 37.5 million gallons per day (mgd) and serves an estimated population of 321,500 people.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Board have classified Los Coyotes WRP as a major discharger. It has a Threat to Water Quality and Complexity Rating of 1-A, pursuant to CCR Section 2200.

Treatment at the Los Coyotes WRP consists of primary sedimentation, activated sludge biological treatment, secondary sedimentation with coagulation, inert media filtration, chlorination and dechlorination. No facilities are provided for solids processing at the plant. Sewage solids separated from the wastewater are returned to the trunk sewer for conveyance to JWPCP for treatment and disposal. Attachment 2 is a schematic of the Los Coyotes WRP wastewater flow.

1. *Primary sedimentation.* The main objective of primary sedimentation is to remove solids from the wastewater by gravity. The heavier solids (settleable solids) precipitate out and are scraped out of the primary sedimentation basin. The lighter solids float to the top and are skimmed off. However, some solids remain in suspension. Sedimentation basins in the Los Coyotes WRP are rectangular in shape and 20 feet deep.
2. *Activated sludge.* The activated sludge process is a treatment system in which the incoming wastewater is mixed with existing biological floc (microorganisms, bugs, or activated sludge) in an aeration basin. Activated sludge converts non-settleable and dissolved organic contaminants into biological floc, which can then be removed from the wastewater with further treatment.
3. *Secondary sedimentation with coagulation.* The main objective of secondary sedimentation is to remove biological floc from the wastewater. Chemicals, such as aluminum sulfate (alum), may be added as part of the treatment process to enhance solids removal. Alum causes the biological floc to combine into larger clumps (coagulate). This makes it easier to remove the floc.
4. *Inert media filtration.* The filtration process is used to remove or reduce suspended or colloidal matter from a liquid stream, by passing the water through a bed of graded granular material. In the case of the Los Coyotes WRP, sand and coal is the filtration media. Filters remove the solids that the secondary sedimentation process did not remove, thus, improving the disinfection efficiency and reliability.
5. *Chlorination.* Gaseous chlorine is used as a disinfectant in the Los Coyotes WRP. Chlorine is added to the treated effluent prior to the filters to destroy bacteria, pathogens and viruses, and to minimize algal growth in the filters. Additional chlorine may be dosed prior to the serpentine chlorine contact chamber.
6. *Dechlorination.* Prior to discharge, sulfur dioxide is added to the treated effluent to remove residual chlorine.
7. *Sludge.* No facilities are provided for solids processed at the plant. All sewage solids separated from the wastewater are returned to the trunk sewer for conveyance to CSDLAC's Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP), where treatment and disposal occur, under Order No. 97-090 (NPDES No. CA0053813). Attachment 2 is a schematic of the Los Coyotes WRP wastewater flow.

Water Recycling Facility. The Discharger currently recycles about 12% (34 million gallons per year) of the total treated effluent and plans to continue doing so. The production, distribution, and reuse of recycled water are presently regulated under Water Reclamation Requirements (WRR) contained in Order No.

87-51, adopted by this Board on April 27, 1987. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13523, these WRRs were reviewed in 1997 and were readopted without change in Board Order No. 97-072, adopted on May 12, 1997.

Recycled water is used for irrigation of landscapes, athletic fields, ornamental plants, and agricultural crops. Recycled water reuse areas include parks, schools, golf courses, and nurseries in the Los Coyotes WRP's distribution system. CSDLAC is promoting additional reuse options for the treated effluent.

As illustrated on the Schematic of Wastewater Flow (Attachment 3) for the Los Coyotes WRP, the recycled water that is piped for reuse is not dechlorinated to maintain an adequate level of residual chlorine to prevent regrowth of bacteria during distribution.

Storm Water Management. CSDLAC does not treat storm water runoff at the Los Coyotes WRP, except for stormwater infiltration and inflows in the sewer and stormwater that fall on or run on to the treatment tanks. It has developed and implemented a Storm Water Pollution Control Plan for storm water that does not enter the treatment system.

IV. DISCHARGE OUTFALL AND RECEIVING WATER DESCRIPTION

The Los Coyotes WRP discharges tertiary treated wastewater to Reach 1 of the San Gabriel River, a water of the United States, through Discharge Serial No. 001 (Latitude 33°52'47", Longitude 118°06'26"). Reach 1 is part of the San Gabriel River Watershed. Discharge Serial No. 001 is located 1,230 feet upstream of the Artesia Freeway, above the estuary. During dry weather (May 1 – October 31), the primary sources of water flow in San Gabriel River, downstream of the discharge point, are the Los Coyotes WRP effluent and other NPDES-permitted discharges, including urban runoff conveyed through the municipal separate storm sewer system. Storm water and urban runoff are regulated under an NPDES permit, Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharges within the County of Los Angeles (LA Municipal Permit), NPDES Permit No. CAS004001.

The Los Angeles County Flood Control District channelized portions of the San Gabriel River to convey and control floodwater and to prevent damage to homes located adjacent to the river. Although not its main purpose, the San Gabriel River serves as conveyance of treated wastewater along with urban runoff. Notwithstanding that the San Gabriel River is concrete-lined from the point of discharge to the estuary, the watershed supports a diversity of wildlife, particularly an abundance of avian species such as the *Least Bell's Vireo*, *Tricolored Blackbird*, and *California Gnatcatcher*. Aquatic life, such as fish, invertebrates, and algae, also exist in the San Gabriel River.

V. DISCHARGE QUALITY

From July 1995 to December 2001, the Discharger's discharge monitoring reports showed the following:

- treated wastewater average annual flow rate of 36.23 mgd;

- average annual removal rates of 97.4% and >99%, of BOD and total suspended solids, respectively; and,
- 7-day median and daily maximum coliform values as <1 coliform forming units (CFU)/100 mL in the treated wastewater.

Based on data submitted in the 2000 Annual Summary Report, Table 1 presents the characteristics of the effluent discharged. (The “<” symbol indicates that the pollutant was not detected (ND) at that concentration level).. Attachment D contains more extensive statistical analyses of the effluent priority pollutants data from July 1995 to June 2001.

Table 1
Effluent Characteristics

CTR#	Constituent	Unit	Ave. or Range	Maximum	Minimum
	Flow	mgd	36.25	38.67	35.51
	pH	pH units	7.2	7.3	7.1
	Temperature	°F	74 winter 79 summer	76 81	73 75
	BOD ₅ 20°C	mg/L	6	7	5
	Suspended solids	mg/L	<1	2	<1
	Settleable solids	ml/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
	Total dissolved solids	mg/L	844	893	805
	Chloride	mg/L	226	257	187
	Sulfate	mg/L	136	156	120
	Boron	mg/L	0.62	0.72	0.51
	Total Phosphate	mg/L	4.0	6.0	1.9
	Turbidity	NTU	1.1	1.5	0.8
	Oil and grease	mg/L	0.3 - <2	<4	<1
	Fluoride	mg/L	0.71	1.08	0.52
	MBAS	mg/L	0.49	0.72	0.3
	Ammonia-N	mg/L	13.6	15.0	12.3
	Organic-N	mg/L	2.1	3.2	1.0
	Nitrate-N	mg/L	0.85	1.53	0.39
	Nitrite-N	mg/L	1.16	1.55	0.83
	Total Nitrogen	mg/L	17.68	19.22	16.49
1	Antimony	µg/L	1.7	3.2	1.1
2	Arsenic	µg/L	2.2	2.8	1.2
3	Beryllium	µg/L	<2.5	<2.5	<2.5
4	Cadmium	µg/L	<2 - <3	<3	<2
5a	Chromium III				
5b	Chromium VI				
	Total Chromium	µg/L	<10	<10	<10
6	Copper	µg/L	<10	<10	<10
	Iron	µg/L	236	360	165
7	Lead	µg/L	<10 - <20	<20	<10
8	Mercury	µg/L	0.2	0.7	0.1
9	Nickel	µg/L	8 - <20	20	<20
10	Selenium	µg/L	0.2 - <1	1.1	<1
11	Silver	µg/L	<10	<10	<10

CTR#	Constituent	Unit	Ave. or Range	Maximum	Minimum
12	Thallium	µg/L	<0.5 - <1	<1	<0.5
13	Zinc	µg/L	60	90	50
14	Cyanide	µg/L	<10	<10	<10
16	2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	µg/L	<1 - <2	<2	<1
17	Acrolein	µg/L	<10	<10	<10
18	Acrylonitrile	µg/L	<10	<10	<10
19	Benzene	µg/L	< 0.5	<0.5	<0.5
20	Bromoform	µg/L	<0.5 - <1	<1	<0.5
21	Carbon tetrachloride	µg/L	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3
22	Chlorobenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
23	Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	<0.1 – 0.9	0.9	<0.1
24	Chloroethane	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
25	2-Chloroethylvinyl ether	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
26	Chloroform	µg/L	13	18	7
27	Bromodichloromethane	µg/L	1.4	3.2	1
28	1,1-Dichloroethane	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
29	1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	< 0.3	<0.3	<0.3
30	1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
31	1,2-Dichloropropane	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
32	1,3-Dichloropropylene	µg/L	< 0.5	<0.5	<0.5
33	Ethylbenzene	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
34	Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)	µg/L	<1 - <2.5	<2.5	<1
35	Methyl chloride (Chloromethane)	µg/L	<1 - <2.5	<2.5	<1
36	Methylene chloride	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
37	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	< 0.5	<0.5	<0.5
38	Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	<0.3 - <1	<1	<0.3
39	Toluene	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
40	1,2-Trans-dichloroethylene	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
41	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	<0.5 - <1	<1	<0.5
42	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	< 1	<1	<1
43	Trichloroethylene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
44	Vinyl chloride	µg/L	<0.3	<0.3	<0.3
45	2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
46	2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
47	2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	<1 – 4	4	<1
48	2-Methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
49	2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	<6	<6	<6
50	2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
51	4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
52	3-Methyl-4-chlorophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
53	Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
54	Phenol	µg/L	<1 – 1	1	<1
55	2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
56	Acenaphthene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
57	Acenaphthylene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
58	Anthracene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
59	Benzidine	µg/L	<20	<20	<20
60	Benzo(a)anthracene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1

CTR#	Constituent	Unit	Ave. or Range	Maximum	Minimum
61	Benzo(a)pyrene	µg/L	<0.2	<0.2	<0.2
62	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
63	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
64	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
65	Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
66	Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
67	Bis(2-chloroisopropyl)ether	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
68	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
69	4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
70	Butylbenzyl phthalate	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
71	2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
72	4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
73	Chrysene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
74	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
75	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
76	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
77	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
78	3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
79	Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	<1 – 2	2	<1
80	Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
81	Di-n-butyl phthalate	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
82	2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
83	2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
84	Di-n-octyl phthalate	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
85	1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
86	Fluoranthene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
87	Fluorene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
88	Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
89	Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
90	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	<5	<5	<5
91	Hexachloroethane	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
92	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
93	Isophrone	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
94	Naphthalene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
95	Nitrobenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
96	N-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA)	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
97	N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
98	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
99	Phenanthrene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
100	Pyrene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
101	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
102	Aldrin	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
103	alpha-BHC	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
104	beta-BHC	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
105	gamma-BHC (Lindane)	µg/L	0.02	0.02	0.02
106	delta-BHC	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
107	Chlordane	µg/L	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05
108	4,4'-DDT	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01

CTR#	Constituent	Unit	Ave. or Range	Maximum	Minimum
109	4,4'-DDE	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
110	4,4- DDD	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
111	Dieldrin	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
112	alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
113	beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
114	Endosulfan sulfate	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
115	Endrin	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
116	Endrin aldehyde	µg/L	<0.04	<0.04	<0.04
117	Heptachlor	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
118	Heptachlor epoxide	µg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
	Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)				
119	Aroclor 1016	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
120	Aroclor 1221	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
121	Aroclor 1232	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
122	Aroclor 1242	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
123	Aroclor 1248	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
124	Aroclor 1254	µg/L	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05
125	Aroclor 1260	µg/L	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
126	Toxaphene	µg/L	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5

VI. APPLICABLE LAWS, PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

The requirements contained in the proposed Order are based on the requirements and authorities contained in the following:

- A. **Federal Clean Water Act.** The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires that point source discharges of pollutants to a water of the United States must be done in conformance with an NPDES permit. NPDES permits establish effluent limitations that incorporate various requirements of the CWA designed to protect water quality.

- B. **Basin Plan.** The Board adopted a revised *Water Quality Control Plan, Los Angeles Region: Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties* (Basin Plan) on June 13, 1994, amended on January 27, 1997, by Regional Board Resolution No. 97-02. This updated and consolidated plan represents the Board's master water quality control planning document and regulations. The revised Basin Plan was approved by the State Board and the State of California Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on November 17, 1994, and February 23, 1995, respectively. The Basin Plan (i) designates beneficial uses for surface and groundwaters, (ii) sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated (existing and potential) beneficial uses and conform to the state's antidegradation policy, and (iii) includes implementation provisions, programs, and policies to protect all waters in the Region. In addition, the Basin Plan incorporates (by reference) all applicable State and Regional Board plans and policies and other state pertinent water quality policies and regulations. The 1994 Basin Plan was prepared to be consistent with all applicable State and Regional Board plans and policies adopted from

1994 and earlier. The accompanying Order implements the plans, policies and provisions of the Board's Basin Plan.

C. **Sources of Drinking Water Policy.** On May 19, 1988, the State Board adopted Resolution No. 88-63, *Sources of Drinking Water (SODW) Policy*, which established a policy that all surface and ground waters, with limited exemptions, are suitable or potentially suitable for municipal and domestic supply. To be consistent with State Board's SODW policy, on March 27, 1989, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 89-03, *Incorporation of Sources of Drinking Water Policy into the Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) – Santa Clara River Basin (4A)/ Los Angeles River Basin (4B)*.

D. Consistent with Regional Board Resolution No. 89-03 and State Board Resolution No. 88-63, in 1994 the Regional Board conditionally designated all inland surface waters in Table 2-1 of the 1994 Basin Plan as existing, intermittent, or potential for Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN). However, the conditional designation in the 1994 Basin Plan included the following implementation provision: "no new effluent limitations will be placed in Waste Discharge Requirements as a result of these [potential MUN designations made pursuant to the SODW policy and the Regional Board's enabling resolution] until the Regional Board adopts [a special Basin Plan Amendment that incorporates a detailed review of the waters in the Region that should be exempted from the potential MUN designations arising from SODW policy and the Regional Board's enabling resolution]." On February 15, 2002, the USEPA clarified its partial approval (May 26, 2000) of the 1994 Basin Plan amendments and acknowledged that the conditional designations do not currently have a legal effect, do not reflect new water quality standards subject to USEPA review, and do not support new effluent limitations based on the conditional designations stemming from the SODW Policy until a subsequent review by the Regional Board finalizes the designations for these waters. This permit is designed to be consistent with the existing Basin Plan.

E. **Beneficial Uses.**

1. The designated beneficial uses in the Basin Plan for the San Gabriel River and its contiguous waters are:

San Gabriel River: Firestone Boulevard to the Estuary -Hydrologic Unit 405.15

Existing: water contact¹ recreation and non-contact water recreation; and,

¹ Although the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works post signs prohibiting access to the San Gabriel River, its tributaries and estuary, the public has been observed fishing and wading across the river. There is public access to the San Gabriel River, its tributaries, and estuary through the bike trails that run parallel to the river. Since there is public contact in the receiving water downstream of the discharge, the quality of wastewater discharged to the San Gabriel River Estuary must be such that no public health hazard is created.

Potential: warm freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; and municipal and domestic water supply (MUN).

The potential MUN beneficial use for the water body is consistent with Regional Board Resolution 89-03; however the Regional Board has only conditionally designated the MUN beneficial use and at this time cannot establish effluent limitations designed to protect the conditional designation.

San Gabriel River Estuary - Hydrologic Unit 405.15

Existing: industrial service supply; navigation; water contact¹ recreation and non-contact water recreation; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; wildlife habitat; rare, threatened, or endangered species; migration of aquatic organisms; and spawning, reproduction, and/or early development.

Potential: shellfish harvesting.

2. Since there is public contact in the receiving water downstream of the discharge, the quality of wastewater discharged to the San Gabriel River and to the San Gabriel River Estuary must be such that no public health hazard is created.
- F. **Antidegradation Policy.** On October 28, 1968, the State Board adopted Resolution No. 68-16, *Maintaining High Quality Water*, which established an antidegradation policy for State and Regional Boards. Similarly, the CWA (section 304(d)(4)(B)) and USEPA regulations (40 CFR section 131.12) require that all permitting actions be consistent with the federal antidegradation policy.
- G. **California Toxics Rule (CTR).** The USEPA promulgated the CTR criteria that became effective on May 18, 2000 (codified as 40 CFR section 131.38). The CTR established water quality criteria for priority toxic pollutants in California's inland surface water ways. The CTR also provides a schedule of compliance not to exceed 5 years from the date of permit renewal for an existing discharger if the discharger demonstrates that it is infeasible to promptly comply with the CTR criteria. The human health criteria for carcinogens in the CTR is based on an incremental cancer risk level of one in a million (10^{-6}). USEPA recognizes that adoption of criteria at a different risk factor is outside of the scope of the CTR. However, States have the discretion to adopt water quality criteria that result in a higher risk level, if the chosen risk level has been demonstrated to adequately protect the most highly exposed subpopulation, and all necessary public outreach participation has been conducted. This demonstration has not been conducted in California. Further, information that is available on highly exposed subpopulations in California supports the need to protect the general population at the 10^{-6}

level. The discharger may undertake a study, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Chapter 3 of USEPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook: Second Edition (EPA-823-B-005a, August 1994) to demonstrate that a different risk level is more appropriate for discharges subject to the Order. Upon completion of the study, the State Board and Regional Board will review the results and determine if the risk level proposed is more appropriate. In the mean time, the State will continue using a 10^{-6} risk level, as it has done historically, to protect the population against carcinogenic pollutants.

Prior to promulgating the criteria, USEPA conducted a costs and benefits analysis. USEPA assessed the potential compliance costs that facilities may incur to meet permit limits based on the CTR. The analysis included capital costs and operation and maintenance costs for end-of-pipe pollution control, indirect source controls, pollution prevention, monitoring, and costs of pursuing alternative methods of compliance. USEPA projected that for publicly owned treatment works (POTWs), the average cost per plant would range between \$61,000 to \$324,000 per year.

CSDLAC submitted comments stating that they would need to spend over \$2 billion on advanced treatment, to comply with the CTR-based effluent limits in the tentative permits mailed out in February 2001. The Regional Board and State Board contracted SAIC to perform an independent analysis of the cost of compliance with the new CTR-based effluent limits (to protect all designated beneficial uses in the Basin Plan, including potential MUN), for the Los Coyotes WRP and the other four CSDLAC WRP NPDES permits. SAIC prepared a report in which they concluded that one facility, the Pomona WRP, might require granular activated carbon (GAC) to meet the revised permit limits, but most facilities would likely be able to use process optimization and pollutant minimization programs alone. In no case did SAIC think that some of the more sophisticated and expensive technologies, such as reverse osmosis, would be required. The total cost of compliance with CTR-based limits for each of the WRPs was estimated between \$0.4 and \$1.2 million per year.

- H. ***State Implementation Plan (SIP).*** Anticipating USEPA's promulgation of the CTR, the State Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (also known as the State Implementation Plan or SIP) on March 2, 2000. The SIP was amended by Resolution No. 2000-30, on April 26, 2000, and the Office of Administrative Law approved the SIP on April 28, 2000. The SIP applies to discharges of toxic pollutants to inland surface waters, enclosed bays and estuaries of California which are subject to regulation under the State's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Division 7 of the Water Code) and the Clean Water Act. The policy provides for the following:
1. implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria promulgated by USEPA through the CTR and for priority pollutant objectives established by Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) in their water quality control plans (Basin Plans);

2. monitoring requirements for priority pollutants with insufficient data to determine reasonable potential;
 3. monitoring requirements for 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalents; and,
 4. chronic toxicity control.
- I. **Watershed Approach.** This Regional Board has been implementing a Watershed Management Approach (WMA), to address water quality protection in the Los Angeles Region following the USEPA guidance in *Watershed Protection: A Project Focus* (EPA841-R-95-003, August 1995). The objective of the WMA is to provide a more comprehensive and integrated strategy resulting in water resource protection, enhancement, and restoration while balancing economic and environmental impacts within a hydrologically-defined drainage basin or watershed. The WMA emphasizes cooperative relationships between regulatory agencies, the regulated community, environmental groups, and other stakeholders in the watershed to achieve the greatest environmental improvements with the resources available. The accompanying Order fosters the implementation of this approach by protecting beneficial uses in the watershed and requiring CSDLAC to participate with the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River Watershed Council, and other stakeholders, in the development and implementation of a watershed-wide monitoring program. On January 17, 2001, Regional Board staff gave a presentation before the Watershed Council, discussed components of the tentative NPDES permits for the five CSDLAC WRPs, and requested their future participation in the development of a watershed-wide monitoring program. The watershed-wide monitoring program is expected to be developed within one year from the effective date of the accompanying Order.

The *Los Angeles & San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council* is a nonprofit organization which is tracking activities throughout the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River watersheds. Its goal is to help facilitate a process to preserve, restore, and enhance all aspects of both watersheds. Currently, it is initiating the development of a Watershed Management Plan for both watersheds.

- J. **CWA 303(d) Listed Pollutants.** On May 12, 1999, USEPA approved the State's 1998 list of impaired waterbodies prepared pursuant to CWA 303(d). The list (hereinafter referred to as the 303(d) list) identifies waterbodies where water quality standards are not expected to be met after the implementation of technology-based effluent limitations on point sources (water quality-limited waterbodies).

The San Gabriel River and its tributaries are on the 303(d) List for the following pollutants/stressors, from point and non-point sources:

San Gabriel River Reach 1 (Estuary to Firestone) -- Hydrologic Unit 405.15

- Abnormal fish histology, algae, ammonia, coliform, and toxicity.

San Gabriel River Estuary -- Hydrologic unit 405.15

- Abnormal fish histology and arsenic (in fish tissue).

- K. **Total Maximum Daily Loads.** A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is a determination of the amount of a pollutant from point, nonpoint, and natural background sources, with a margin of safety, that may be discharged to a water quality-limited water body. The regulatory requirements for TMDL are codified in 40 CFR section 130.7. Section 303(d) of the CWA requires that TMDLs must be developed for the pollutants of concern which impact the water quality of water bodies on the 303(d) list. The Regional Board is developing a TMDL that will assess the extent and sources of the ammonia and algae (nutrient) problems in the San Gabriel River. Under the March 23, 1999, amended consent decree between the USEPA and *Heal the Bay, et al.*, (Case No. C 98-4825 SBA, *Heal the Bay, Santa Monica Bay Keeper, et al. v. Browner, et.al.*), TMDLs for nitrogen and heavy metals for the San Gabriel River Watershed must be completed by March 2003 and March 2006, respectively. The remaining TMDLs, such as abnormal fish histology, algae, and coliform are tentatively scheduled for completion by 2012, 2003, and 2012, respectively (subject to reevaluation). Subsequent to the effective date of the TMDLs, this Order or its successors will be reopened and modified to include final effluent limits for 303(d) listed constituents that will be consistent with the waste load allocations in the relevant TMDLs.
- L. Pursuant to this Regional Board's watershed initiative framework, the San Gabriel River Watershed Management Area was the targeted watershed for fiscal year 1999-2000. However, the NPDES permit renewals were re-scheduled so that provisions of the CTR and SIP could be incorporated into the permits.

On June 29, 2000, the Regional Board published the *San Gabriel River State of the Watershed Report* (State of the Watershed Report). This document contains a summary of water quality problems and issues in the San Gabriel River Watershed, describes the San Gabriel River and its tributaries, presents an overview of the existing monitoring data, and suggests that further monitoring is required. This report forms the basis for the water quality element of future watershed plans.

As described in the State of the Watershed Report, the San Gabriel River drains a 689 square mile area of eastern Los Angeles County; its headwaters originate in National Forest lands in the San Gabriel Mountains. The San Gabriel River watershed consists of extensive areas of undisturbed riparian and woodland habitats in its upper reaches. The U.S. Congress has set aside a wilderness area in much of the West and East Forks of the San Gabriel River. Towards the middle of the watershed, large spreading grounds are used to recharge groundwater basins. The watershed is hydraulically connected to the Los Angeles River Watershed through the Whittier Narrows Reservoir. Nurseries and small stable areas are located along channelized portions of the river. The lower part of the San Gabriel River Watershed is heavily urbanized.

- M. **Performance Goals.** In Order No. 95-077, the Regional Board implemented the Water Quality Task Force² recommendations on the use of performance goals, rather than performance-based limits, when appropriate. In the absence of an Inland Surface Water Plan and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries Plan, performance goals were intended to minimize pollutant loadings (primarily toxics) and, at the same time, maintain the incentive for future voluntary improvement of water quality whenever feasible, without the imposition of more stringent limits based on improved performance. Effluent performance goals were not enforceable limitations or standards. The accompanying Order does not contain performance goals, but rather implements controls as referenced below to reflect technology-based effluent limits and WQBELs.

VII. REGULATORY BASIS FOR EFFLUENT LIMITS AND DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

- A. **Water Quality Objectives and Effluent Limits.** Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) and effluent limitations in this permit are based on:
- The plans, policies and water quality standards (beneficial uses + objectives + antidegradation policy) contained in the 1994 *Water Quality Control Plan, Los Angeles Region: Basin Plan for the Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties*, as amended;
 - California Toxics Rule (40 CFR 131.38);
 - The State Board's "Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California" (the State Implementation Plan or SIP);
 - USEPA Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Programs Final May 31, 1996;
 - USEPA Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy July 1994;
 - Applicable Federal Law Regulations
 - Federal Clean Water Act, and
 - 40 CFR Parts 122, 125, and 131, among others; and,
 - Best professional judgment (pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44).

Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established in the Basin Plan, 40 CFR section 122.44(d) specifies that water quality based effluent limits may be set based on USEPA criteria and supplemented where necessary by other relevant information to attain and maintain narrative water quality criteria to fully protect designated beneficial uses.

- B. U.S. EPA regulations, policy, and guidance documents upon which Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) was developed may include, in part:
- Inspectors Guide for Evaluation of Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants, April 1979 (EPA/430/9-79-010);

² *Working Together for an Affordable Clean Water Environment.* A final report presented to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region by Water Quality Advisory Task Force, September 1993.

- Fate of Priority Pollutants in Publicly Owned Treatment Works Pilot Study October 1979 (EPA-440/1-79-300);
- Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control March 1991 (EPA-505/ 2-90-001); and,
- USEPA NPDES Permit Writers' Manual, December 1996 (EPA-833-B-96-003).

- C. **Mass and Concentration Limits.** 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(1) requires that except under certain conditions, all permit limits, standards, or prohibitions be expressed in terms of mass units. 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(2) allows the permit writer, at its discretion, to express limits in additional units (e.g., concentration units). The regulations mandate that, where limits are expressed in more than one unit, the permittee must comply with both.

Generally, mass-based limits ensure that proper treatment, and not dilution, is employed to comply with the final effluent concentration limits. Concentration-based effluent limits, on the other hand, discourage the reduction in treatment efficiency during low-flow periods and require proper operation of the treatment units at all times. In the absence of concentration-based effluent limits, a permittee would be able to increase its effluent concentration (i.e., reduce its level of treatment) during low-flow periods and still meet its mass-based limits. To account for this, this permit includes mass and concentration limits for some constituents.

- D. **Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations.** Pursuant to 40 CFR 122.45(d)(2), for a POTW's continuous discharges, all permit effluent limitations, standards, and prohibitions, including those necessary to achieve water quality standards, shall, unless impracticable, be stated as average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations. It is impracticable to only include average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations in the permit, because a single daily discharge of certain pollutants, in excess amounts, can cause violations of water quality objectives. The effects of certain pollutants on aquatic organisms are often rapid. For many pollutants, an average weekly or average monthly effluent limitation alone is not sufficiently protective of beneficial uses. As a result, maximum daily effluent limitations, as referenced in 40 CFR 122.45(d)(1), are included in the permit for certain constituents as discussed in the Fact Sheet accompanying this Order.
- E. **Pretreatment.** Pursuant to 40 CFR section 403, CSDLAC developed and has implemented an approved industrial wastewater pretreatment program. This Order requires implementation of the approved pretreatment program.
- F. **Sewage Sludge.** To implement CWA section 405(d), on February 19, 1993, USEPA promulgated 40 CFR Part 503 to regulate the use and disposal of municipal sewage sludge. The accompanying Order implements the regulations and it is the responsibility of the Discharger to comply with said regulations, which are enforceable by USEPA.

- G. **Storm Water.** CWA section 402(p), as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1987, requires NPDES permits for storm water discharges. Pursuant to this requirement, in 1990, USEPA promulgated 40 CFR section 122.26 that established requirements for storm water discharges under an NPDES program. To facilitate compliance with federal regulations, on November 1991, the State Board issued a statewide general permit, *General NPDES Permit No. CAS000001 and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities*. This permit was amended in September 1992 and reissued on April 17, 1997 in State Board Order No. 97-03-DWQ.

General NPDES permit No. CAS000001 is applicable to storm water discharges from the Los Coyotes WRP's premises.. On June 4, 1992, CSDLAC filed a Notice of Intent to comply with the requirements of the general permit. CSDLAC developed and currently implements a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), to comply with the State Board's (Order No. 97-03-DWQ).

- H. **Federal Clean Water Act (CWA).** Numeric and narrative effluent limitations are established pursuant to Section 301 (Effluent Limitations), Section 302 (Water Quality-Related Effluent Limitations), Section 303 (Water Quality Standards and Implementation Plans), Section 304 (Information and Guidelines [Effluent]), Section 305 (Water Quality Inventory), Section 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards), and Section 402 (NPDES) of the CWA. The CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharges herein.

I. **Antibacksliding** provisions are contained in Sections 303(d)(4) and 402(o) of the CWA, and in 40 CFR section 122.44(l). Those provisions require a reissued permit to be as stringent as the previous permit with some exceptions. Section 402(o) of the CWA establishes express statutory language prohibiting the backsliding of effluent limitations. It consists of the following three parts:

1. Section 402(o)(1) prohibits (subject to exceptions in section 303(d)(4) and/or 402(o)(2)) the relaxation of effluent limitations for two situations:
 - a. When a permittee seeks to revise a technology-based effluent limitation based on BPJ to reflect a subsequently promulgated effluent guideline which is less stringent, and
 - b. When a permittee seeks relaxation of an effluent limitation which is based upon a changed State treatment standard or water quality standard.
2. Section 402(o)(2) outlines specific exceptions to the general prohibition against establishment of less stringent effluent limitations. Section 402(o)(2) provides that the establishment of less stringent limits may be allowed where:

- a. There have been material and substantial alterations or additions to the permitted facility which justify this relaxation;
- b. Information (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) is available that was not available at the time of permit issuance which would have justified a less stringent effluent limitation;
- c. Technical mistakes or mistaken interpretations of the law were made in issuing the permit under Section 402(a)(1)(b);
- d. Good cause exists due to events beyond the permittee's control (e.g., acts of God) and for which there is no reasonably available remedy;
- e. The permit has been modified under certain specified sections of the CWA; or,
- f. The permittee has installed and properly operated and maintained required treatment facilities, but still has been unable to meet the permit limitations (relaxation may only be allowed to the treatment levels actually achieved).

Although the statute identified six exceptions where effluent limitations may be relaxed, the language specifically stated that exception "c" (as listed above) does not apply to water quality-based effluent limitations. Further, exception "e" as listed above only concerns sections of the CWA governing technology-based limits. Thus, exceptions c & e would only apply to technology-based effluent limitations.

3. Section 402(o)(3) prohibits the relaxation of effluent limitations in all cases if a revised effluent limitation would result in a violation of applicable effluent limitation guidelines or water quality standards, including antidegradation requirements. Thus, even if any of the antibacksliding exceptions outlined in either the statute or regulations are applicable, Section 402(o)(3) acts as a floor and restricts the extent to which effluent limitations may be relaxed. This requirement affirms existing provisions of the CWA that require limits, standards, and conditions to ensure compliance with applicable technology-based limits and water quality standards.
- J. The relaxation of effluent limitations for certain discharges covered by this Order are excepted from antibacksliding pursuant to CWA sections 402(o)(2)(B)(i) and 303(d)(4), independently, because information is available about the likelihood of constituents to be present in concentrations with a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to

excursions above water quality standards, which would have justified the application of less stringent effluent limitations for certain pollutants at the time the NPDES permit was previously issued. Pursuant to the reasonable potential analysis (Attachment R), certain constituents that previously had water quality-based effluent limitations have been shown not to have reasonable potential, and as a result no longer require effluent limitations to protect water quality standards. Separately, the relaxation of WQBELs based on MUN is consistent with section 303(d)(4) of the CWA as authorized by section 402(o)(1). The constituents identified in this paragraph were limited in the prior order to protect water quality standards associated with the MUN designation. In fact the receiving water bodies have no such designation and the applicable water quality standards associated with the constituents identified in this paragraph are being attained. Therefore, relaxation of the prior, MUN-derived WQBELs is also allowed under CWA section 303(d)(4). Consistent with antibacksliding statutes and regulations and antidegradation policies, the continued effluent limitations contained in this Order are at least as stringent as existing effluent limitation guidelines and are fully protective of existing, intermittent, and potential designated uses.

- K. **Applicable Water Quality Objectives.** 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(vi)(A) requires the establishment of numeric effluent limitations to attain and maintain applicable narrative water quality criteria to protect the designated beneficial use.

The Basin Plan includes narrative and numeric Water Quality Objectives (WQOs). The CTR promulgates numeric aquatic life criteria for 23 toxic pollutants and numeric human health criteria for 57 toxic pollutants. A compliance schedule provision in the CTR and the SIP authorizes the State to issue schedules of compliance for new or revised NPDES permit limits based on the federal criteria when certain conditions are met.

Where numeric water quality objectives have not been established in the Basin Plan, 40 CFR section 122.44(d) specifies that WQBELs may be set based on USEPA criteria and supplemented, where necessary, by other relevant information to attain and maintain narrative water quality criteria to fully protect designated beneficial uses.

- L. **Types of Pollutants.** For CWA regulatory purposes, pollutants are grouped into three general categories under the NPDES program: conventional, toxic, and non-conventional. By definition, there are five conventional pollutants (listed in 40 CFR 401.16): 5-day biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease. Toxic or "priority" pollutants are those defined in Section 307(a)(1) of the CWA (and listed in 40 CFR 401.12 and 40 CFR 423, Appendix A) and include metals and organic compounds. Non-conventional pollutants are those which do not fall under either of the two previously described categories and include such parameters as ammonia, nitrogen, phosphorous, chemical oxygen demand, and whole effluent toxicity, etc.

- M. ***Technology-based Limits for Municipal Facilities (POTWs).*** Technology-based effluent limits require a minimum level of treatment for industrial/municipal point sources based on currently available treatment technologies while allowing the discharger to use any available control techniques to meet the effluent limits. The 1972 CWA required POTWs to meet performance requirements based on available wastewater treatment technology. Section 301 of the CWA established a required performance level--referred to as "secondary treatment"--that all POTWs were required to meet by July 1, 1977. More specifically, Section 301(b)(1)(B) of the CWA required that EPA develop secondary treatment standards for POTWs as defined in Section 304(d)(1). Based on this statutory requirement, EPA developed national secondary treatment regulations which are specified in 40 CFR 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all POTWs and identify the minimum level of effluent quality to be attained by secondary treatment in terms of five-day biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, and pH.
- N. ***Water Quality Based Effluent Limits (WQBELs).*** Water quality based effluent limits are designed to protect the quality of the receiving water by ensuring that State water quality standards are met by discharges from an industrial/municipal point source. If, after technology-based effluent limits are applied, a point source discharge will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable water quality criterion, then 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) requires that the permit contain a WQBEL. Although the CWA establishes explicit technology-based requirements for POTWs, Congress did not exempt from POTWs from additional regulation to protect water quality standards. As a result, POTWs are also subject to WQBELs. Applicable water quality standards for the San Gabriel River are contained in the Basin Plan and CTR, as described in previous findings.
- O. ***Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations for Toxic Pollutants.*** Toxic substances are regulated in this permit by WQBELs derived from the 1994 Basin Plan, the CTR, and/or best professional judgment (BPJ) pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44. If a discharge causes, has a reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to a receiving water excursion above a narrative or numeric objective within a State water quality standard, federal law and regulations, as specified in 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), and in part, the SIP, require the establishment of WQBELs that will protect water quality. As documented in Table R and the fact sheet, pollutants exhibiting reasonable potential in the discharge, authorized in this Order, are identified in the Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) section and have final effluent limits. The discharger is required to gather the appropriate data and the Regional Board will determine if final effluent limits are needed. If final limits are needed, the permit will be reopened and limits will be included in the permit.
- P. ***Basis for Effluent Limits for 303(d) Listed Pollutants.*** For 303(d) listed pollutants, the Regional Board plans to develop and adopt total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) which will specify wasteload allocations (WLAs) for

point sources and load allocations (LA) for non-point sources, as appropriate. Following the adoption of TMDLs by the Regional Board, NPDES permits will be issued, and where appropriate, reopened to include effluent limits consistent with the assumptions of the TMDL, based on applicable WLAs. In the absence of a TMDL, the permits will include water quality-based effluent limitations derived as provided in the CTR and SIP (if applicable). These effluent limits are based on criteria applied to end-of-pipe.

VIII. REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

As specified in 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include limits for all pollutants “which the Director (defined as the Regional Administrator, State Director, or authorized representative in 40 CFR section 122.2) determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard.” Using the method described in the SIP, the Regional Board has conducted Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) using the discharger’s effluent data contained in Table D. The RPA compares the effluent data with water quality objectives in the Basin Plan and CTR.

- a. ***Reasonable Potential Determination*** The RPA (per the SIP) involves identifying the observed maximum pollutant concentration in the effluent (MEC) for each constituent based on the effluent concentration data. There are three tiers to determining reasonable potential. If any of the following three tiers is triggered, then reasonable potential exists:
 - For the first tier, the MEC is compared with the lowest applicable Water Quality Objective (WQO), which has been adjusted for pH, hardness and translator data, if appropriate. If the MEC is greater than the (adjusted) WQO, then there is reasonable potential for the constituent to cause or contribute to an excursion above the WQO and a WQBEL is required. However, if the pollutant was not detected in any of the effluent samples and all of the reported detection limits are greater than or equal to the WQO, proceed with Tier 2. The Regional Board exercised its discretion in identifying all available, valid, relevant, representative data and information in accordance with SIP Section 1.2 (page 8).
 - For the second tier, if the MEC is less than the adjusted WQO, then the observed maximum ambient background concentration (B) for the pollutant is compared with the adjusted WQO. If B is greater than the adjusted WQO, then a WQBEL is required. If B is less than the WQO, then a limit is only required under certain circumstances to protect beneficial uses. If a constituent was not detected in any of the effluent samples and all of the detection limits are greater than or equal to the adjusted WQO, then the ambient background water quality concentration is compared with the adjusted WQO. The Regional Board exercised its discretion in identifying all available, applicable

ambient background data in accordance with SIP Section 1.4.3 (page 16).

- For the third tier, other information is used to determine RPA, such as the current CWA 303(d) List. Section 1.3 of the SIP describes the type of information that can be considered in Tier 3.

For all parameters that have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a WQO/criteria, numeric WQBELs are required. Section 1.4, Step 5 of the SIP (page 8) states that maximum daily effluent limitations (MDELs) shall be used for POTWs in place of average weekly limitations. WQBELs are based on CTR, USEPA water quality criteria, and Basin Plan objectives.

If the data are unavailable or insufficient to conduct the RPA for the pollutant, or if all reported detection limits of the pollutant in the effluent are greater than or equal to the WQO, the Regional Board will establish interim requirements, in accordance with Section 2.2.2. of the SIP, that require additional monitoring for the pollutant in place of a WQBEL. Upon completion of the required monitoring, the Regional Board shall use the gathered data to conduct a RPA and determine if a WQBEL is required. However, if Tier 1 or Tier 3 triggered reasonable potential for a pollutant, then the lack of receiving water data for Tier 2 evaluation would not inhibit the establishing WQBELs in the permit.

A numerical limit has not been prescribed for a toxic constituent if it has been determined that it has no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to excursions of water quality standards. However, if the constituent had a limit in the previous permit, and if none of the Antibracksliding exceptions apply, then the limit will be retained. A narrative limit to comply with all water quality objectives is provided in *Standard Provisions* for the priority pollutants which have no available numeric criteria.

The limits for 11 metals (antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium VI, lead, selenium, silver, zinc, iron); a few organics (tetrachloroethylene, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane, 1,4-Dichlorobenzene, gamma-BHC (lindane), halomethanes); fluoride, methylene blue activated substances (MBAS) contained in Order No. 95-077 will be removed because they lack reasonable potential. Existing effluent limitations for these constituents were derived from California Code of Regulations (Title 22) maximum contaminant levels for the protection of potential MUN beneficial use. The removal of effluent limitations for the aforementioned discharges covered by this Order are excepted from antibracksliding pursuant to CWA sections 402(o)(2)(B)(i) and 303(d)(4) because information is available about the potential MUN designated use that was not available at the time Order No. 95-077, and its predecessors were issued, which would have justified the application of less stringent effluent limitation at the time the NPDES permit was previously issued. The Title 22-derived effluent limitations were applied based no such designed on information that potential MUN was a designated use of the receiving water. In fact, there has been no such designation, and the conditional

designation has no legal effect at this time. Consistent with antibacksliding statutes and regulations, the effluent limitations contained in this Order are at least as stringent as existing effluent limitation guidelines and are fully protective of existing, intermittent, and potential designated uses.

- b. **RPA Data.** The RPA was based on effluent monitoring data for July 1995 through May 2000, and interim monitoring results from July 2001 to December 2001. Table R (Attachment R) of the fact sheet summarizes the RPA, lists the constituents, and where available, the lowest, adjusted WQO, the MEC, the "Reasonable Potential" result, and the limits from the previous permit.

Metals Water Quality Objective. For metals, the lowest applicable Water Quality Objective (WQO) was expressed as total recoverable, and, where applicable, adjusted for hardness. Hardness values from samples collected in the receiving water upstream of the discharge point were averaged and used to determine the appropriate CTR WQO for those hardness-dependent metals. Under critical conditions effluent discharged from the Los Coyotes WRP contributes the largest flow into the San Gabriel River Watershed in the vicinity of the discharge point.

Interim Monitoring Requirements. In accordance with the SIP, the Regional Board may impose interim monitoring requirements upon the Discharger, so that the Discharger obtains adequate ambient, background water samples for metals and organic priority pollutants upstream from the discharge point. The Executive Officer directed the Discharger to begin an interim monitoring program for the duration of 18 months, beginning July 2001. The Discharger has been collecting samples on a monthly basis for all priority pollutants, with the exception of asbestos and 2,3,7,8-TCDD which are sampled semiannually, and reporting the results quarterly to the Regional Board. After the additional information is gathered, and prior to April 2003, Regional Board staff will conduct RPA once again, to determine if additional numerical limitations are necessary. Section 1.3, Step 8, of the SIP authorizes the Regional Board to use the gathered data to conduct RPA, as outlined in Steps 1 through 7, and determine if a water quality-based effluent limitation is required.

A reopener provision is included in the accompanying Order that allows the permit to be reopened to allow the inclusion of new numeric limitations for any constituent that exhibits reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedance of applicable water quality objectives.

The Order is consistent with State and Federal antidegradation policies in that it does not authorize a change in the quantity of wastewater discharged by the facility, nor does it authorize a change or relaxation in the manner of treatment. As a result, both the quantity and quality of the discharge are expected to remain the same or improve, consistent with antidegradation policies. In general, conformance with reasonable potential analysis procedures identified in State Board and USEPA documents, effluent

limitations for some toxic constituents are not carried forth in this Order because there is not presently a reasonable potential for the constituents to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards. Without reasonable potential, there is no longer a need to maintain prior WQBELs under WQBEL regulations, antibacksliding provisions, or antidegradation policies. The accompanying monitoring and reporting program requires continued data collection and if monitoring data show a reasonable potential for a constituent to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards, the permit will be reopened to incorporate appropriate WQBELs. Such an approach ensures that the discharge will adequately protect water quality standards for potential and existing uses and conforms with antidegradation policies and antibacksliding provisions.

The Regional Board also notes that the discharges regulated by the accompanying Order are discharges from a POTW. A POTW receives sewage from myriad domestic and industrial sources, with the industrial sources subject to pretreatment requirements. These diverse sewage sources are all subject to primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment and chlorination/dechlorination at the POTW. Due to the nature of a POTW, the discharger would not be able to adjust treatment techniques to exploit removed effluent limitations, without running the risk of violating effluent limits for nonpriority pollutants. It is technically difficult and would also trigger a reopening of the NPDES permit. As a result, the accompanying Order is consistent with antidegradation because the discharge will not change or increase.

For some priority pollutants, the applicable water quality objectives are below the levels that current technology can measure. Section 2.4.5 of the SIP discusses how compliance will be determined in those cases. The discharger should work with the laboratory to lower detection levels to meet applicable and reliable detection limits; follow procedures set forth in 40 CFR section 136; and, report the status of their findings in the annual report. During the term of the permit, if and when the monitoring with lowered detection limits shows any of the above at levels exceeding the applicable WQOs, the discharger will be required to initiate source identification and control for the particular constituent. Appendix 4 of the SIP lists the minimum levels and laboratory techniques for each constituent.

In the case of cyanide, the monthly average limitation in the accompanying Order is lower than the lowest minimum level (ML) listed in Attachment 4 of the SIP, 5 µg/L, using the colorimetric technique. CSDLAC and other Dischargers have contacted Regional Board staff and State Board staff communicating the difficulty they are experiencing in achieving that low ML level for cyanide, the uncertainty in the results due to possible matrix interferences, and the possible impacts of interferences on the test method. CSDLAC submitted a workplan to investigate the assertion that matrix interferences cause spurious, random detections of cyanide in the total cyanide analytical test (Standard Methods Section 4500CN and EPA 335.1). In their workplan, CSDLAC proposes to: (i) establish matrix-specific MDLs, pursuant to 40 CFR section 136, and provide a broad-

based evaluation of background effects using the method of standard additions; (ii) utilize an independent, EPA approved analytical test method (EPA 1677, ligand exchange method) to evaluate the presence of any available cyanide remaining after wastewater treatment; and, (iii) directly analyze the finite number of inert metal cyanide complexes which could possibly survive the treatment plant process and chlorination, which could be detected by the total cyanide method, but not by EPA method 1677. During the course of the eight-month investigation, the Discharger will continue using 10 µg/L as an interim matrix specific ML.

IX. WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

Numeric toxic constituent limitations are based on the Basin Plan the narrative water quality objective for toxic constituents, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to, or that produce detrimental physiological responses in, human, plant, animal, or aquatic life"; on the CTR; and, the interpretation of the Basin Plan narrative criteria using USEPA's 304(a) nationally recommended water quality criteria. For toxic constituents that have no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to excursions of water quality objectives, no numerical limitations are prescribed.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 122.45(d)(2), for a POTWs continuous discharges, all permit effluent limitations, standards, and prohibitions, including those necessary to achieve water quality standards, shall, unless impracticable, be stated as average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for POTWs. It is impracticable to only include average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations in the permit, because a single daily discharge of a pollutant, in excess amounts, can cause violations of water quality objectives. The effects of pollutants on aquatic organisms are often rapid. For many pollutants, an average weekly or average monthly effluent limitation alone is not sufficiently protective of beneficial uses. As a result, maximum daily effluent limitations, as referenced in 40 CFR 122.45(d)(1), are included in the permit.

Furthermore, Section 1.4 of the SIP requires the step-by-step procedure to "adjust" or convert CTR numeric criteria into Average Monthly Effluent Limitations (AMELs) and Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations (MDELs), for toxics.

- Step 3 of Section 1.4 of the SIP (page 6) lists the statistical equations that adjust CTR criteria for effluent variability.
- Step 5 of Section 1.4 of the SIP (page 8) lists the statistical equations that adjust CTR criteria for averaging periods and exceedance frequencies of the criteria/ objectives. This section also reads, "For this method only, maximum daily effluent limitations shall be used for publicly-owned treatment works (POTWs) in place of average weekly limitations.

Table R is the spreadsheet that staff used to calculate the AMELs and MDELs for priority pollutants.

40 CFR section 122.45(f)(1) requires that except under certain conditions, all permit limits, standards, or prohibitions be expressed in terms of mass units. 40

CFR section 122.45(f)(2) allows the permit writer, at its discretion, to express limits in additional units (e.g., concentration units). The regulations mandate that, where limits are expressed in more than one unit, the permittee must comply with both.

Generally, mass-based limits ensure that proper treatment, and not dilution, is employed to comply with the final effluent concentration limits. Concentration-based effluent limits, on the other hand, discourage the reduction in treatment efficiency during low-flow periods and require proper operation of the treatment units at all times. In the absence of concentration-based effluent limits, a permittee would be able to increase its effluent concentration (i.e., reduce its level of treatment) during low-flow periods and still meet its mass-based limits. To account for this, this permit includes mass and concentration limits for some constituents, except during wet-weather, storm events that cause flows to the treatment plant to exceed the plant's design capacity.

A. Effluent Limitations:

1. Limits for Conventional and nonconventional pollutants:

Constituent	Units	Discharge Limitations		
		Daily Maximum ^[1]	7-Day Average ^[2]	Monthly Average
BOD ₅ 20°C	mg/L	45	30 ^a	20 ^a
	lbs/day ^[3]	14,100	9,400	6,300
Suspended solids	mg/L	45	40 ^a	15 ^a
	lbs/day ^[3]	14,100	12,500	4,700
Settleable solids	ml/L	0.3	--	0.1 ^b
Oil and grease	mg/L	15	--	10 ^c
	lbs/day ^[3]	4,700	--	3,100
Total residual chlorine	mg/L	0.1 ^[4]	--	--
Total inorganic nitrogen	mg/L	--	--	8
(nitrate + nitrite as Nitrogen)	lbs/day ^[3]	--	--	2200
Total Ammonia	mg/L	^[5]	--	^[5]
	lbs/day	^[3]	--	^[3]

[1] The daily maximum effluent concentration limit shall apply to both flow weighted 24-hour composite samples and grab samples, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment T).

[2] As defined in Standard Provisions, Attachment N.

[3] The mass emission rates are based on the plant design flow rate of 37.5 mgd. During wet-weather storm events in which the flow exceeds the design capacity, the mass discharge rate limitations shall not apply, and concentration limitations will provide the only applicable effluent limitations.

[4] Based on results of continuous monitoring, total residual chlorine concentration of up to 0.3 mg/L, at the point in treatment train immediately following dechlorination, shall not be considered violations of this requirement provided the total duration of such excursions do not exceed 15 minutes during any 24-hour period. Peaks in excess of 0.3 mg/L lasting less than one minute while changing sulfur dioxide tanks shall not be considered a violation of this requirement.

- [5] CSDLAC must meet the total ammonia limitations contained in attachment H, Basin Plan Tables 3-2 and 3-4, for the protection of freshwater aquatic habitat, by June 14, 2002. The total ammonia numeric limits are protective of warm freshwater aquatic habitat and take into account the effect of un-ionized ammonia on aquatic habitat. Therefore, a separate limit for un-ionized ammonia is not necessary.

2. Basis for Conventional and nonconventional pollutants:

- a. Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) and Suspended solids
Biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) is a measure of the quantity of the organic matter in the water and, therefore, the water's potential for becoming depleted in dissolved oxygen. As organic degradation takes place, bacteria and other decomposers use the oxygen in the water for respiration. Unless there is a steady resupply of oxygen to the system, the water will quickly become depleted of oxygen. Adequate dissolved oxygen levels are required to support aquatic life. Depressions of dissolved oxygen can lead to anaerobic conditions resulting in odors, or, in extreme cases, in fish kills.

40 CFR Part 133 describes the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, for BOD and suspended solids, as:

- the monthly average shall not exceed 30 mg/L and
- the 7-day average shall not exceed 45 mg/L.

Los Coyotes WRP provides tertiary treatment, as such, the limits in the permit are more stringent than secondary treatment requirements. The Plant achieves solids removal that are better than secondary-treated wastewater by adding a polymer (Alum) to enhance the precipitation of solids, and by filtering the effluent.

The monthly average, the 7-day average, and the daily maximum limits cannot be removed because none of the antibacksliding exceptions apply. Those limits were all included in the previous permit (Order 95-077) and the Los Coyotes WRP has been able to meet all three limits (monthly average, the 7-day average, and the daily maximum), for both BOD and suspended solids.

In addition to having mass-based and concentration-based effluent limitations for BOD and suspended solids, the Long Beach WRP also has a percent removal requirement for these two constituents. In accordance with 40 CFR sections 133.102(a)(3) and 133.102(b)(3), the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. Percent removal is defined as a percentage expression of

the removal efficiency across a treatment plant for a given pollutant parameter, as determined from the 30-day average values of the raw wastewater influent pollutant concentrations to the facility and the 30-day average values of the effluent pollutant concentrations for a given time period.

b. Settleable solids

Excessive deposition of sediments can destroy spawning habitat, blanket benthic (bottom dwelling) organisms, and abrade the gills of larval fish. The limits for settleable solids are based on the Basin Plan (page 3-16) narrative, "Waters shall not contain suspended or settleable material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses." The numeric limits are empirically based on results obtained from the settleable solids 1-hour test, using an Imhoff cone.

It is impracticable to use a 7-day average limitation, because short-term spikes of settleable solid levels that would be permissible under a 7-day average scheme would not be adequately protective of all beneficial uses. The monthly average and the daily maximum limits cannot be removed because none of the antibacksliding exceptions apply. The monthly average and daily maximum limits were both included in the previous permit (Order 95-077) and the Los Coyotes WRP has been able to meet both limits.

c. Oil and grease

Oil and grease are not readily soluble in water and form a film on the water surface. Oily films can coat birds and aquatic organisms, impacting respiration and thermal regulation, and causing death. Oil and grease can also cause nuisance conditions (odors and taste), are aesthetically unpleasant, and can restrict a wide variety of beneficial uses. The limits for oil and grease are based on the Basin Plan (page 3-11) narrative, "Waters shall not contain oils, greases, waxes, or other materials in concentrations that result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, that cause nuisance, or that otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses."

The numeric limits are empirically based on concentrations at which an oily sheen becomes visible in water. It is impracticable to use a 7-day average limitation, because spikes that occur under a 7-day average scheme could cause a visible oil sheen. A 7-day average scheme would not be sufficiently protective of beneficial uses. The monthly average and the daily maximum limits cannot be removed because none of the antibacksliding exceptions apply. Both limits were included in the previous permit (Order 95-077)

and the Los Coyotes WRP has been able to meet both limits.

d. Residual chlorine

Disinfection of wastewaters with chlorine produces a chlorine residual. Chlorine and its reaction products are toxic to aquatic life. The limit for residual chlorine is based on the Basin Plan (page 3-9) narrative, "Chlorine residual shall not be present in surface water discharges at concentrations that exceed 0.1 mg/L and shall not persist in receiving waters at any concentration that causes impairment of beneficial uses."

It is impracticable to use a 7-day average or a 30-day average limitation, because it is not as protective as of beneficial uses as a daily maximum limitation is. Chlorine is very toxic to aquatic life and short-term exposures of chlorine may cause fish kills.

e. Fluoride

The existing permit effluent limitation of 1.6 mg/l for fluoride was developed based on the Basin Plan incorporation of Title 22, *Drinking Water Standards*, by reference. However, the Regional Board has new information about the appropriate designated uses for the water body, and based on the current designated uses and the lack of reasonable potential, a limit for fluoride is unnecessary and inappropriate. Therefore, the accompanying Order will not contain a limit for fluoride. The relaxation of the effluent limitation for fluoride is excepted from antibacksliding pursuant to CWA sections 402(o)(2)(B)(i) and 303(d)(4).

f. Total Dissolved Solids, Sulfate, Chloride, and Boron

No limits are prescribed for total dissolved solids, sulfate, chloride, and boron because Basin Plan Table 3-8 (page 3-13) reads, "no waterbody specific objectives," for the San Gabriel River watershed between Firestone Boulevard and San Gabriel River estuary. In addition, there are no applicable water quality criteria for these constituents to protect the designated uses of this reach of the San Gabriel River.

g. Iron

The existing permit effluent limitation of 300 mg/l for iron was developed based on the Basin Plan chemical constituent incorporation of Title 22, *Drinking Water Standards*, by reference. However, the Regional Board has new information about the appropriate designated uses for the water body, and based on the current designated uses and the lack of reasonable potential, a limit for iron is unnecessary and inappropriate. Furthermore, the discharge

from Los Coyotes WRP does not exhibit reasonable potential to exceed the USEPA *Quality Criteria for Water* 1976 (EPA 440/9-76-023) [the Redbook] limit of 1000 µg/L. Therefore, the accompanying Order will not contain a limit for iron. The relaxation of the effluent limitation for iron is excepted from antibacksliding pursuant to CWA sections 402(o)(2)(B)(i) and 303(d)(4).

h. *Methylene Blue Activated Substances (MBAS)*

The existing permit effluent limitation of 0.5 mg/l for MBAS was developed based on the Basin Plan incorporation of Title 22, *Drinking Water Standards*, by reference. However, the Regional Board has new information about the appropriate designated uses for the water body, and based on the current designated uses, a limit for MBAS is unnecessary and inappropriate. Therefore, the accompanying Order will not contain a limit for MBAS. The relaxation of the effluent limitation for MBAS is excepted from antibacksliding pursuant to CWA sections 402(o)(2)(B)(i) and 303(d)(4).

i. *Total Inorganic Nitrogen*

Total inorganic nitrogen is the sum of Nitrate-nitrogen and Nitrite-nitrogen. High nitrate levels in drinking water can cause health problems in humans. Infants are particularly sensitive and can develop methemoglobinemia (blue-baby syndrome). Nitrogen is also considered a nutrient. Excessive amounts of nutrients can lead to other water quality impairments.

1. **Algae.** Several reaches of the San Gabriel River are 303(d) listed for algae. Excessive growth of algae and/or other aquatic plants can degrade water quality. Algal blooms sometimes occur naturally, but they are often the result of excess nutrients (i.e., nitrogen, phosphorus) from waste discharges or nonpoint sources. These algal blooms can lead to problems with tastes, odors, color, and increased turbidity and can depress the dissolved oxygen content of the water, leading to fish kills. Floating algal scum and algal mats are also an aesthetically unpleasant nuisance.

The 303(d) listing for algae is being addressed by applying the narrative WQO for biostimulatory substances, "Waters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growth to the extent that such growth causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses," and other relevant information to arrive at a mass based-

limit intended to be protective of the beneficial uses, pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(d). Total nitrogen will be the indicator parameter intended to control algae, pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(C).

2. **Concentration-based limit.** Basin Plan Table 3-8 (page 3-13) reads, “no waterbody specific objectives,” for the San Gabriel River watershed between Firestone Boulevard and San Gabriel River estuary (downstream from Willow Street) including Coyote Creek. In addition, there are no applicable water quality criteria for these constituents to protect the designated uses of this reach of the San Gabriel River. However, the San Gabriel River is 303d listed for algae/nutrients. The effluent limit for total inorganic nitrogen of 8 mg/L was set based on the average concentration achievable by proposed nitrification/ denitrification (NDN) technology proposed by the Discharger. The limit is intended to prevent CSDLAC from discharging unlimited amounts of nutrients to the San Gabriel River.

3. **Mass-based limit.** The mass emission rates are based on the plant design flow rate of 37.5 mgd. CSDLAC provided information to Regional Board staff about the proposed NDN technology. According to CSDLAC, if the Los Coyotes WRP achieves reductions in nitrogen-containing compounds similar to those achieved in the Whittier Narrows pilot project, then the inorganic nitrogen concentrations would be 8 mg/L, ammonia concentrations would be about 1 mg/L, and organic nitrogen concentrations would be 1 mg/L, or total nitrogen would be 10 mg/L. That means that the NDN technology is expected to achieve a 58% reduction in total nitrogen. This reduction is intended to alleviate the algae problem. The % nitrogen load reduction from the Los Coyotes WRP was calculated in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{\% nitrogen} \\ \text{reduction} &= 10 \text{ mg/L} \div 17.28 \text{ mg/L} \times 100 \\ &= \frac{\text{projected total} \div \text{five-year}}{\text{average} \times 100} \\ & \quad \text{nitrogen} \quad \quad \quad \text{nitrogen} \\ & \quad \text{concentration} \quad \text{concentration} \end{aligned}$$

Watershed-wide monitoring will track concentration levels of phosphorus and all nitrogen series pollutants present in

the effluent and receiving waters, pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(C)(3).

j. Total ammonia

Ammonia is a pollutant routinely found in the wastewater effluent of Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs), in landfill-leachate, as well as in run-off from agricultural fields where commercial fertilizers and animal manure are applied. Ammonia exists in two forms – un-ionized ammonia (NH_3) and the ammonium ion (NH_4^+). They are both toxic, but the neutral, un-ionized ammonia species (NH_3) is much more toxic, because it is able to diffuse across the epithelial membranes of aquatic organisms much more readily than the charged ammonium ion. The form of ammonia is primarily a function of pH, but it is also affected by temperature and other factors. Additional impacts can also occur as the oxidation of ammonia lowers the dissolved oxygen content of the water, further stressing aquatic organisms. Oxidation of ammonia to nitrate may lead to groundwater impacts in areas of recharge. [However, there is no GWR designated for these reaches]. Ammonia also combines with chlorine (often both are present in POTW treated effluent discharges) to form chloramines – persistent toxic compounds that extend the effects of ammonia and chlorine downstream.

Ammonia is 303(d) listed in the San Gabriel River. Since ammonia has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion of a water quality objective, a water quality-based effluent limitation for total ammonia is required in order to be protective of the water quality objective. This limit must be met at the end-of-pipe by June 14, 2002. The total ammonia numeric limits are protective of warm freshwater aquatic habitat and take into account the effect of un-ionized ammonia on aquatic habitat. Therefore, a separate limit for un-ionized ammonia is not necessary. Numeric limits for total ammonia are contained in Basin Plan Tables 3-2 and 3-4 (Attachment H of the permit). At a future date, these tables will be replaced with the 1999 USEPA Ammonia Update criteria for ammonia.

Regional Board staff will prepare a Time Schedule Order (TSO) for CSDLAC to come into compliance with the total ammonia limitation by September 30, 2003. The compliance date was based on CSDLAC's letter dated January 5, 2001, titled *Status Report on POTWs Progress Toward Achieving Compliance With Inland Surface Water Ammonia Objective*. In that letter, CSDLAC communicated to the Regional Board that the modifications and construction to the Long Beach WRP, the Los Coyotes WRP, Pomona WRP, San Jose

Creek WRP, and the Whittier Narrows WRP are scheduled for completion by June 2003. The TSO will contain interim limits for total ammonia from May 23,2002 to September 2003.

The values that appear in the 1994 Basin Plan Ammonia Tables were based on the *Quality Criteria for Water 1986* (EPA 440/5-86-001) document.

To express the 1-Hour and the 4-Day total ammonia concentrations as nitrogen, the tabulated values should be multiplied by the 0.822 conversion factor. The factor was obtained by using stoichiometry.

Atomic mass of nitrogen = 14.01. Atomic mass of hydrogen = 1.008. In one mole of ammonia (NH₃), there is one nitrogen for every 3 hydrogens. Therefore, the molecular weight of NH₃ = 14.01 + (3 x 1.008) = 17.034. The conversion factor is:

$$\frac{1 \text{ mole N}}{1 \text{ mole NH}_3} = \frac{14.01 \text{ mg N}}{17.037 \text{ mg NH}_3} = 0.822$$

k. Coliform

Total and fecal coliform bacteria are used to indicate the likelihood of pathogenic bacteria in surface waters. Given the nature of the facility, a wastewater treatment plant, pathogens are likely to be present in the effluent in cases where the disinfection process is not operating adequately. As such, the permit contains the following filtration and disinfection technology-based effluent limitations for coliform:

- the median number of coliform organisms at some point in the treatment process must not exceed 2.2 per 100 milliliters, and
- the number of coliform organisms must not exceed 23 per 100 milliliters in more than one sample within any 30-day period.

These limits for coliform must be met at the point of the treatment train immediately following disinfection. Coliform is 303(d) listed in reach one of the San Gabriel River. However, the disinfection and filtration processes reduce the likelihood of having pathogens in the effluent. Most of the time the coliform analyses results are reported as less than 1 MPN/ 100 mL. It is not likely that the 303(d) listing of coliform is due to the discharge of treated effluent from the Discharger. Therefore, the technology-based effluent limitation is also protective of water quality.

- i. pH
The hydrogen ion activity of water (pH) is measured on a logarithmic scale, ranging from 0 to 14. While the pH of “pure” water at 25°C is 7.0, the pH of natural waters is usually slightly basic due to the solubility of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Minor changes from natural conditions can harm aquatic life. The effluent limitation for pH which reads, “the wastes discharged shall at all times be within the range of 6.5 to 8.5,” is taken from the Basin Plan (page 3-15) which reads “the pH of inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.5 as a result of waste discharge.”
- m. Turbidity
Turbidity is an expression of the optical property that causes light to be scattered in water due to particulate matter such as clay, silt, organic matter, and microscopic organisms. Turbidity can result in a variety of water quality impairments. The effluent limitation for turbidity which reads, “For the protection of the water contact recreation beneficial use, the wastes discharged to water courses shall have received adequate treatment, so that the turbidity of the wastewater does not exceed: (a) a daily average of 2 Nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs); and (b) 5 NTUs more than 5 percent of the time (72 minutes) during any 24 hour period,” is based on the Basin Plan (page 3-17).
- n. Radioactivity
Radioactive substances are generally present in natural waters in extremely low concentrations. Mining or industrial activities increase the amount of radioactive substances in waters to levels that are harmful to aquatic life, wildlife, or humans. The existing effluent limitation for radioactivity which reads, “Radioactivity of the wastes discharged shall not exceed the limits specified in Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 5, Section 64443, of the California Code of Regulations, or subsequent revisions,” is based on the Basin Plan’s incorporation of Title 22, *Drinking Water Standards*, by reference. However, the Regional Board has new information about the appropriate designated uses for the water body, and based on the current designated uses and the lack of reasonable potential, the existing effluent limitation for radioactivity will be removed. The discharge will instead be subject to the Basin Plan’s (Basin Plan page 3-15) narrative limitation on radionuclides, “Radionuclides shall not be present in concentrations that are deleterious to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life or that result in accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” The relaxation of the effluent limitation for radioactivity is excepted from antibacksliding pursuant to

CWA sections 402(o)(2)(B)(i) and 303(d)(4).

3. Toxicity.

Reach one of the San Gabriel River is 303(d) listed for toxicity. Ambient monitoring data indicates that the background concentration in the lower San Gabriel is toxic to aquatic organisms, and therefore exceeds water quality standards. Also, effluent monitoring data exceeds water quality standards. Therefore, pursuant to the SIP, reasonable potential exists for toxicity. As such, the permit contains effluent limitations for toxicity.

The toxicity limitations are based on:

- the Basin Plan objectives and implementation provisions for toxicity
- Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Programs Final May 31, 1996, and
- Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy July 1994.

Acute Toxicity Limitation:

The dischargers may test for Acute toxicity by using USEPA's Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of effluent to Freshwater and Marine Organisms, September 1991 (EPA 600/4-90/027). Acute toxicity provisions in the accompanying Order are derived from the Basin Plan's toxicity standards (Basin Plan 3-16 and 3-17). The provisions require the discharger to accelerate acute toxicity monitoring and take further actions to identify the source of toxicity and to reduce acute toxicity.

Chronic Toxicity Limitation and Requirements:

Chronic toxicity provisions in the accompanying Order are derived from the Basin Plan's toxicity standards (Basin Plan 3-16 and 3-17). The provisions require the discharger to accelerate chronic toxicity monitoring and take further actions to identify the source of toxicity and to reduce chronic toxicity. The monthly median effluent limitation of 1.0 TU_c for chronic toxicity is based on *USEPA Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Programs* Final May 31, 1996 (Chapter 2 – Developing WET Permitting Conditions, page 2-8). In cases where effluent receives no dilution or where mixing zones are not allowed, the 1.0 TU_c chronic criterion should be expressed as a monthly median. The “median” is defined as the middle value in a distribution, above which and below which lie an equal number of values. For example, if the results of the WET testing for a month were 1.5, 1.0, and 1.0 TU_c, the median would be 1.0 TU_c.

The *USEPA Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Programs* Final May 31, 1996 (Chapter 2 – Developing WET Permitting Conditions, page 2-8) recommends a statistical approach to developing a maximum daily effluent

limitation. The daily maximum limit of 1.6 TU_c was derived using SIP procedures (a statistical approach) to calculate a maximum daily effluent limitation, using historical effluent chronic toxicity data from annual discharge monitoring reports.

4. Limits for priority pollutants:

CTR # ^[1]	Constituent	Units	Discharge Limitations	
			Monthly Average ^[2]	Daily Maximum
8	Mercury ^[3]	µg/L	0.051 ^{[5], [6], b}	0.14 ^{[5], [6], b}
		lbs/day ^[4]	0.016	0.044
9	Nickel ^[3]	µg/L	70	194
		lbs/day ^[4]	22	61
14	Cyanide	µg/L	4.2 ^{[5], [6], a}	8.5 ^{[5], [6], a}
		lbs/day ^[4]	1.3	2.6
68	Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate [a.k.a. Diethylhexyl phthalate]	µg/L	5.9 ^{[5], [6], b}	12 ^{[5], [6], b}
		lbs/day ^[4]	1.8	3.7

- [1] This number corresponds to the compound number found in Table 1 of CTR. It is simply the order in which the 126 priority pollutants were listed 40 CFR part 131.38 (b)(1).
- [2] Compliance may be determined from a single analysis or from the average of the initial analysis and three additional analyses taken one week apart after the results of the initial analysis are obtained.
- [3] Concentration expressed as total recoverable.
- [4] The mass emission rates are based on the plant design flow rate of 37.5 mgd. During wet-weather storm events in which the flow exceeds the design capacity, the mass discharge rate limitations shall not apply, and concentration limitations will provide the only applicable effluent limitations.
- [5] For priority pollutants, Section 2.4.5 of CTR *Compliance Determination*, reads, "Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reported ML."
- [6] This effluent limitation will not be in effect until June 10, 2007, and until that time the Discharger shall comply with the interim limits established in I.A.8. below.

Additional Footnotes - Priority Pollutants:

- a. Based on most stringent CTR criteria [Criterion Continuous Concentration (CCC)] for the protection of freshwater aquatic life. To arrive at this calculated limitation, the CTR CCC was adjusted, according to SIP Section 1.4.

Federal Register Vol. 65, No. 97, page 31689, discusses the basis for the aquatic life criteria in the CTR. The Criterion Maximum Concentration (CMC), a short term concentration limit, and the Criterion Continuous Concentration (CCC), a four day concentration limit, are designed to provide protection of aquatic life and its uses from acute and chronic toxicity to animals and plants. The criteria are intended to identify average pollutant concentrations which will produce water quality generally suited to maintenance of aquatic life and designated uses while restricting the duration of excursions over the average so that total exposures will not cause unacceptable adverse effects.

Federal Register Vol. 65, No. 97, page 31691, discusses how CCC is intended to be the highest concentration that could be maintained indefinitely in a water body without causing an unacceptable effect on aquatic community or its uses.

- b. Based on most stringent CTR criteria for the protection of human health from consumption of organisms only. CTR criteria was adjusted according to SIP Section 1.4, to arrive at this calculated limitation. Note that the CTR criteria for the protection of human health from consumption of water and organisms was not considered, since MUN is not an existing beneficial use for the receiving water.

5. Basis for priority pollutants:

Mixing zones and dilution credits are not used in the accompanying order and would be improper to grant in light of the following factors:

- The Los Coyotes WRP discharge contributes the largest flow into the San Gabriel watershed in the vicinity of the discharge point it overwhelms the receiving water providing limited mixing and dilution;
- Even in the absence of the Los Coyotes WRP discharge, the receiving water primarily consists of nuisance flows and other effluents, limiting its ability to assimilate additional waste;
- Several reaches of the San Gabriel River [including those subject to this Order] are 303(d) listed (i.e, impaired);
- Impaired waters do not have the capacity to assimilate pollutants of concern at concentrations greater than the applicable objective;
- For the protection of the beneficial uses, such as rare, threatened, or endangered species.
- For the protection of warm freshwater habitat;

- For the protection of the beneficial uses, such as estuarine habitat; marine habitat; wildlife habitat;
- Because a mixing zone study has not been conducted; and
- Because a hydrologic model of the discharge and the receiving water has not been conducted.

Allowance of a mixing zone is discretionary under Section 1.4.2 of the SIP and under the Basin Plan (Basin Plan 4-30). If the discharger subsequently conducts appropriate mixing zone and dilution credit studies, the Regional Board can evaluate the propriety of granting a mixing zone or establishing dilution credits.

6. Example calculation: Cyanide

Is a limit required? What is RPA?

- From Table R, *Reasonable Potential & Limit Derivation*, we determined that Reasonable potential analysis (RPA) = Yes, therefore a limit is required.

Step 1 – Identify applicable water quality criteria.

From California Toxics Rule (CTR), we can obtain the Criterion Maximum Concentration (CMC) and the Criterion Continuous Concentration (CCC).

Freshwater Aquatic Life Criteria:

CMC = 22 µg/L (CTR page 31712, column B1) and

CCC = 5.2 µg/L (CTR page 31712, column B2); and

Human Health Criteria for Water & Organisms = 700 µg/L.

Step 2 – Calculate effluent concentration allowance (ECA)

ECA = Criteria in CTR, since no dilution is allowed.

Step 3 – Determine long-term average (LTA) discharge condition

a. Calculate CV:

CV = Standard Deviation / Mean

= 0.6 (By default because data was > 80% nondetect, SIP page 6)

b. Find the ECA Multipliers from SIP Table 1 (page 7), or by calculating them using equations on SIP page 6. When CV = 0.6, then:

ECA Multiplier acute = 0.321 and

ECA Multiplier chronic = 0.527.

c. LTA acute = ECA acute x ECA Multiplier acute
= 22 µg/L x 0.321 = 7.062 µg/L

d. LTA chronic = ECA chronic x ECA Multiplier chronic
= 5.2 µg/L x 0.527 = 2.7404 µg/L

Step 4 – Select the lowest LTA.

In this case, LTA chronic < LTA acute, therefore lowest LTA = 2.74 µg/L

Step 5 – Calculate the Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL) & Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL) for AQUATIC LIFE.

- a. Find the multipliers. You need to know CV and n (frequency of sample collection per month). If effluent samples are collected 4 times a month or less, then n = 4. CV was determined to be 0.6 in a previous step.
AMEL Multiplier = 1.55
MDEL Multiplier = 3.11
- b. AMEL aquatic life = lowest LTA (from Step4) x AMEL Multiplier
= 2.74 µg/L x 1.55 = 4.2476 µg/L
- c. MDEL aquatic life = lowest LTA (from Step4) x AMEL Multiplier
= 2.74 µg/L x 3.11 = 8.5226 µg/L

Step 6 – Find the Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL) & Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL) for HUMAN HEALTH.

- a. Find factors. Given CV = 0.6 and n = 4.
For AMEL human health limit, there is no factor.
The MDEL/AMEL human health factor = 2.01
- b. AMEL human health = ECA = 700 µg/L
- c. MDEL human health = ECA x MDEL/AMEL factor
= 700 µg/L x 2.01 = 1407

Step 7 – Compare the AMELs for Aquatic life and Human health and select the lowest. Compare the MDELs for Aquatic life and Human health and select the lowest.

- a. Lowest AMEL = 4.2 µg/L (Based on Aquatic life protection)
 - b. Lowest MDEL = 8.5 µg/L (Based on Aquatic life protection)
7. A numerical limit has not been prescribed for a toxic constituent if it has been determined that it has no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to excursions of water quality standards. A narrative limit to comply with all water quality objectives is provided in *Standard Provisions* for the priority pollutants which have no available numeric criteria.
 8. The numeric limitations contained in the accompanying Order were derived using best professional judgement and are based on applicable state and federal authorities, and as they are met, will be in conformance with the goals of the aforementioned water quality control plans, and water quality criteria; and will protect and maintain existing and potential beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

X. INTERIM REQUIREMENTS

Ammonia

The 1994 Basin plan provides that to protect aquatic life the ammonia concentrations in receiving waters shall not exceed the values for the corresponding instream conditions given in Tables 3-1 to 3-4 of the Basin Plan. Compliance with this requirement is up to 8 years following adoption of the Basin Plan. However, Order No. 97-077, the previous permit, the Discharger was granted up to eight years following the adoption of Order No. 95-077 to: (a) meet the Basin Plan objectives for ammonia by making the necessary adjustments/improvements (to the Plant processes), or (b) conduct studies leading to an approved site specific objective for ammonia. In compliance with Order No. 95-077, the Discharger developed and submitted an eight-year schedule (beginning in 1995 and ending in 2003) to achieve compliance with the ammonia, nitrite- nitrogen, and nitrite plus nitrate nitrogen limitations for all of POTWs in its network. Elements of the schedule included pilot studies, design, construction, and startup of a modified process for nitrification and de-nitrification (NDN).

In addition to modifying all of the POTWs with the NDN process, the Discharger is pursuing site-specific objectives (SSO) for ammonia for some of the POTWs. On December 31, 2001, the Discharger submitted a workplan for the development of ammonia SSOs through development of water effect ratios (WER). A WER adjusts the existing objective to account for site-specific conditions by measuring the actual toxicity of the site water to aquatic species in the waterbody as compared to laboratory dilution water. CSDLAC is following the requirements outlined in the Basin Plan, USEPA guidance, and as specified by the Regional Board for the development of SSOs. The need for a use attainability analysis (UAA) is being assessed throughout the process as data are obtained and the SSO is developed. Regional Board staff have met with the Discharger and its consultant, Larry Walker and Associates, discussing the workplan. Regional Board approval of the workplan is pending.

Because there is reasonable potential, the ammonia objective which was a receiving water quality objective in the previous permit, is a WQBEL in this Order that has to be met at the end-of-pipe by June 14, 2002 (per Basin Plan). The numerical limits for total ammonia applicable to the Los Coyotes discharge are contained in Basin Plan Tables 3-2 and 3-4 (Attachment H of this Order).

Due to the complexity of the network of interconnected CSDLAC POTWs, the good faith efforts that CSDLAC has demonstrated (including the pilot studies completed and the process modification timelines submitted), and, the compliance date provided in Order No. 95-076, this Order is accompanied by a Time Schedule Order requiring CSDLAC to comply with the total ammonia and inorganic nitrogen limitations according to Order No. 95-077 compliance date. Interim limits contained in the TSO will be in effect during construction of the NDN system and will end once the six-week start-up and process optimization phase of the NDN system is completed.

Pollutant Minimization Program

The accompanying Order provides for the use of Pollutant Minimization Program, developed in conformance with Section 2.4.5.1 of the SIP, 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 included in the permit in accordance with sections 2.4.2 or 2.4.3 above, presence of whole effluent toxicity, health advisories for fish consumption, results of benthic or aquatic organisms tissue sampling) that a priority pollutant is present in the discharger's effluent above an effluent limitation.

The Discharger shall develop and conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP), in accordance with Section 2.4.5.1..of the SIP, if all of the following conditions are true, and shall submit the PMP to the Regional Board within 120 days of determining the conditions are true:

1. when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:
 - a. A sample result is reported as detected but not quantified (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the reported ML; or,
 - b. A sample result is reported as nondetect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the MDL.

Examples of evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation are:

- sample results reported as DNQ when the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL);
- sample results from analytical methods more sensitive than those methods included in the permit in accordance with Sections 2.4.2 or 2.4.3;
- presence of whole effluent toxicity;
- health advisories for fish consumption; or,
- results of benthic or aquatic organism tissue sampling.

The goal of the PMP is to reduce all potential sources of a priority pollutant(s) through pollution minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures as appropriate, to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the WQBEL.

In a letter dated June 30, 2000, CSDLAC proposed a plan with a logical sequence of actions to achieve full compliance with the limits in the accompanying Order. The first phase of the plan is to investigate the sources of the high levels of contaminants in the collection system. If the sources can be identified, source reduction measures (including, when appropriate, Pollution Minimization Plans) will be instituted. At the time the accompanying Order is considered, CSDLAC is unsure whether or not all sources contributing to the high contaminant levels can be identified. Therefore, a parallel effort will be made to evaluate the appropriateness of Site Specific Objectives (SSO) and, when necessary, Use

Attainability Analysis (UAA), and modifications to and/or construction of, treatment facilities. If it is determined that a SSO or UAA is necessary, CSDLAC will submit a written request for a SSO study, accompanied by a preliminary commitment to fund the study, to the Regional Board. The Discharger will then develop a workplan and submit it to the Regional Board for approval prior to the initiation of the studies.

Interim Limits

The Los Coyotes WRP may not be able to achieve immediate compliance with the limit for mercury, nickel, cyanide, or bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate contained in Section I.A.2.(b).. Data submitted in previous self monitoring reports indicate that these constituents have been detected in the effluent, at least once, at a concentration greater than the new limit proposed in the accompanying Order.

40 CFR section 131.38(e) provides conditions under which interim effluent limits and compliance schedules may be issued, but the current Basin Plan does not allow the inclusion of interim limits and compliance schedules within NPDES permits for effluent limits based on water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. However, the CTR does allow inclusion of an interim limit within an NPDES permit for priority pollutants (not for ammonia) if the limit for the priority pollutant is CTR-based. The SIP allows for longer, TMDL-based compliance schedules, but because the USEPA has yet to approve the longer compliance schedules, the CTR's more-stringent 5-year compliance schedule limitation remains in effect. The Regional Board will include interim limits and compliance schedules within the NPDES permit for priority pollutants, if the effluent limit is CTR-based and if the Discharger will have a problem meeting the new effluent limit. CSDLAC will have time to develop a PMP and/or conduct the proposed studies.

XI. MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The discharger will be required to conduct monitoring of influent, effluent, and receiving waters in conformance with Monitoring and Reporting Program No. CI-5059 (Attachment T). The monitoring and reporting program is designed to ensure compliance with the applicable provisions of this Order, and where necessary, to collect information necessary to complete a reasonable potential analysis for CTR constituents.