

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
CENTRAL COAST REGION  
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101  
San Luis Obispo, California 93401**

**ORDER NO. R3-2015-00XX**

**ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY IN THE MATTER OF  
CARPINTERIA SANITARY DISTRICT  
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY**

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region (Central Coast Water Board), having held a public hearing on May 29, 2015 and having considered all the evidence, public comments, and stipulations by the designated parties, finds the following:

**BACKGROUND**

1. The Carpinteria Sanitary District (Discharger) owns and operates a wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system, which provides sewer service for the City of Carpinteria and portions of Santa Barbara County. The treatment system consists of pretreatment, screening, grit removal, primary sedimentation, aerated activated sludge tanks, secondary sedimentation, chlorination, and dechlorination. Treated wastewater is discharged from Discharge Point No. 001 (as described in Order No. R3-2011-0003) to the Pacific Ocean, a water of the United States.
2. On April 16, 2010, the Discharger filed its most recent Report of Waste Discharge for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit number CA 0047364.
3. On February 3, 2011, the Central Coast Water Board adopted Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R3-2011-0003, NPDES CA-0047364, regulating the discharge of waste from the Carpinteria Sanitary District wastewater treatment plant.

**DISCHARGE VIOLATION**

4. On October 3, 2012 the Discharger had a discharge of non-chlorinated (i.e., non-disinfected) effluent to the Pacific Ocean. The parties stipulated that a total of 297,896 gallons of "non-chlorinated" wastewater was discharged when the Discharger's disinfection system failed.
5. On October 29, 2013, investigators from the State Water Resources Control Board, acting in cooperation with the Central Coast Water Board, inspected the Carpinteria Sanitary District facility. The scope of the inspection was to inquire about the cause and any corrective actions resulting from the 2012

ocean discharge and the effluent limitation violations discussed in paragraphs 17 through 19, below.

6. On December 10, 2013, the Assistant Executive Officer of the Central Coast Water Board issued the Discharger a Notice of Violation (NOV) and Investigative Order pursuant to Water Code section 13267 (13267 Order) seeking information regarding discharges and effluent violations that occurred between 2011 and 2013.
7. The Discharger responded to the 13267 Order on January 27, 2014.
8. The Federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. §1311) prohibits the discharge of pollutants from a point source to waters of the United States, unless authorized by a NPDES Permit.
9. Water Code section 13243 states that the Central Coast Water Board may specify certain conditions or areas where the discharge of waste, or certain types of waste, will not be permitted. The Central Coast Water Board implements this section of the Water Code by adopting and implementing the Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan establishes the beneficial uses (Chapter 2) and water quality objectives (Chapter 3) for surface waters for the Central Coast Region, which must be met and maintained to protect those uses.
10. Water Code section 13376 states, in part, "Any person discharging or proposing to discharge pollutants to the navigable waters of the United States within the jurisdiction of this state... shall file a report of the discharge in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 13260..." and "The discharge of pollutants... by any person except as authorized by waste discharge requirements ... is prohibited."
11. Water Code section 13385 includes provisions for assessing administrative civil liability for discharges of wastes to surface waters in violation of the federal Clean Water Act. The discharge incident described above was to surface waters of the United States for which liability can be assessed in accordance with section 13385. Water Code section 13385(c) states, in part, that the Regional Board may impose civil liability administratively for noncompliance with Water Code section 13376 on a daily basis at a maximum of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) for each day in which the violation occurs in accordance with Water Code section 13385(c)(1); and where there is a discharge, any portion of which is not susceptible to cleanup or is not cleaned up, and the volume discharged, but not cleaned up, exceeds 1,000 gallons, an additional liability not to exceed ten dollars (\$10) multiplied by the number of gallons by which the volume discharge, but not cleaned up, exceeds 1,000 gallons; or both, Water Code section 13385(c)(2).

12. The October 3, 2012 discharge is a violation of Prohibition III.B of Order No. R3-2011-0003, which provides in pertinent part that, "Discharge of any waste in any manner other than as described by this Order is prohibited."
13. The October 3, 2012 discharge is also a violation of the Standard Provisions of Order No. R3-2011-0003, which provide, in pertinent part:

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

And:

Safeguards shall be provided to assure maximal compliance with all terms and conditions of this permit. Safeguards shall include preventative and contingency plans and may also include alternative power sources, stand-by generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other precautions. ...

Attachment D, D-1 C. Duty to Mitigate and D-11, B.9, Central Coast Standard Provisions, respectively.

14. While the Discharger immediately reported the discharge on October 3, 2012, the Discharger did not conduct any sampling, pursuant to Provision VIII.A.2 of the Monitoring and Reporting Program of Order No. R3-2011-0003 (Attachment E), which provides in pertinent part:

The Discharger **shall monitor** for total coliform, fecal coliforms, and enterococcus at receiving water sampling stations RSW-F and RSW-G as identified in MRP section II above, in addition to three shore sampling stations approved by the Executive Officer, for seven days after loss of disinfection. (Emphasis added).

Although this failure to conduct sampling could be considered a violation of the Discharger's permit, it is not included in the administrative civil liability imposed herein. In providing notification to the Central Valley Water Board permitting staff, the Discharger was apparently told there was no need to sample after the October 3, 2012 discharge. However, the Discharger is responsible for compliance with the terms of its permit despite verbal directives to the contrary.

15. The October 3, 2012 discharge is subject to a discretionary penalty. This discharge does not qualify as a violation subject to a mandatory minimum penalty under Water Code section 13385(h). Water Code section 13385(e) specifies factors that the Central Coast Water Board shall consider in establishing the amount of civil liability. The Water Quality Enforcement Policy (hereinafter "Enforcement Policy") adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on November 19, 2009, and approved by the Office of Administrative Law on May 20, 2010, establishes a methodology

for assessing administrative civil liability and addresses the factors in Water Code section 13385(e). Attachment A, incorporated herein and made a part of this Order by reference, presents the civil liability assessment derived from the use of the penalty methodology in the Enforcement Policy.

The policy can be found at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/enforcement/docs/enf\\_policy\\_final111709.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/enforcement/docs/enf_policy_final111709.pdf)

### **MANDATORY MINIMUM PENALTY VIOLATIONS**

16. Water Code section 13385, subdivision (h)(2) states, in part, the following: "For the purpose of this section, a 'serious violation' means any waste discharge that violates the effluent limitations ... for a Group II pollutant, as specified in Appendix A to section 123.45 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, by 20 percent or more, or for a Group I pollutant, as specified in Appendix A to section 123.45 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, by 40 percent or more."
17. On December 27, 2011, the Discharger exceeded three effluent limitations for settleable solids set forth in Order No. R3-2011-0003; the daily maximum, the 7-day average and the 30-day average. Settleable solids is a Group 1 pollutant, for which a violation is serious when the limit is exceeded by 40% or more. The Discharger exceeded each of the three effluent limits by 40 percent or more and is therefore subject to \$9,000 in mandatory minimum penalties (MMPs) [\$3,000 for each violation] in accordance with Water Code section 13385(h).  
  
On January 3, 2013, Discharger exceeded the chlorine total residual instantaneous maximum effluent limitation set forth in Order No. R3-2011-0003. Chlorine total residual is a Group 2 pollutant, for which a violation is serious when the limit is exceeded by 20 percent or more. Discharger exceeded the effluent limitation by 20 percent or more and is therefore subject to \$3,000 in MMPs in accordance with Water Code section 13385(h).
18. On January 7, 2013, Discharger exceeded the chlorine total residual instantaneous maximum effluent limitation set forth in Order No. R3-2011-0003 by 20 percent or more and is therefore subject to \$3,000 in MMPs in accordance with Water Code section 13385(h).
19. Attachment B to this Order summarizes the MMP violations described above and is incorporated by reference.
20. The parties stipulated to the imposition of a total of \$15,000 in MMPs for the violations described above and summarized in Attachment B.

### **MINIMUM LIABILITY**

21. The Enforcement Policy requires that the minimum liability be compared to the economic benefit, and that the recommended penalty must be at least 10 percent higher than the economic benefit so that liabilities are not construed as the cost of doing business. The economic benefit in this instance is \$25,534, which represents the delayed and avoided costs of installing an alarm and avoided sampling (please refer to Attachment A). The minimum liability for the discretionary enforcement related to the October 3, 2012 discharge exceeds this amount by more than 10%, which complies with the Enforcement Policy requirement. The minimum liability for the October 3, 2012 discharger would therefore be \$28,087.40.
22. The five (5) MMP violations must be assessed according to Water Code 13385(h) for \$3,000 each, for a total of \$15,000.
23. The total minimum liability is therefore \$43,087.40 [ $\$28,087.40 + \$15,000$ ] for both the discretionary penalties and the MMPs.

#### **MAXIMUM LIABILITY**

24. Pursuant to Water Code section 13385, subdivision (a), any person who violates Water Code section 13376 is subject to administrative civil liability pursuant to Water Code section 13385, subdivision (c), in an amount not to exceed the sum of both of the following: (1) ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) for each day in which the violation occurs and (2) where there is a discharge, any portion of which is not susceptible to cleanup or is not cleaned up, and the volume discharged but not cleaned up exceeds 1,000 gallons, an additional liability not to exceed ten dollars (\$10) multiplied by the number of gallons by which the volume discharged but not cleaned up exceeds 1,000 gallons.
25. The alleged violations, set forth in full in the accompanying Attachment A, constitute violations subject to Water Code section 13385. The maximum liability that the Central Coast Water Board may assess pursuant to Water Code section 13385, subdivision (c) is \$2,978,960, based on a volume of 297,796 gallons (total gallons discharged minus 1,000 gallons) x \$10 per gallon plus \$10,000 per day.
26. MMP violations are usually assessed at \$3,000 per violation, but can be treated as discretionary violations and penalized up to \$10,000 per violation. The five (5) violations assessed \$15,000 in MMPs could therefore be increased to a maximum of \$50,000.
27. The total maximum liability is therefore \$3,028,960 for both the discharge and effluent limitation MMP violations.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**, pursuant to Water Code section 13385, that the Carpinteria Sanitary District is assessed administrative civil liability against

Discharger in the amount of **\$96,775** [**\$81,775** for the October 3, 2012 discharge (see Attachment A) and **\$15,000** (see Attachment B) for the MMPs].

The Discharger shall submit a check payable to the "State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account" in the amount of **\$96,775** to the State Water Resources Control Board, Accounting Office, P.O. Box 100, Sacramento CA 95812-0100 no later than **June 29, 2015**. A copy of the check shall also be submitted to the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Attn: Harvey Packard, 895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 by **June 29, 2015**.

Any person aggrieved by this action of the Central Coast Water Board may petition the State Water Board to review the action in accordance with Water Code section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 2050 et seq. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., 30 days after the date of issuance of this Order, except that if the thirtieth day following the date of the Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions may be found on the internet at [http://waterboards.ca.gov/public\\_notices/petitions/water\\_quality](http://waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality) or will be provided upon request.

**I, Kenneth A. Harris Jr., Executive Officer**, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an order adopted by the Central Coast Water Board on May 29, 2015.

---

Kenneth A. Harris Jr.  
Executive Officer

Attachment A: Penalty Methodology  
Attachment B: MMPs – Effluent Limitation Violations

## ATTACHMENT A

Pursuant to Water Code section 13385(e), the Central Coast Water Board must consider the following factors in determining the amount of liability for the October 3, 2012 unauthorized discharge of un-disinfected secondary effluent to the Pacific Ocean, a water of the United States.

On November 17, 2009, the State Water Board adopted Resolution No. 2009-0083 amending the Water Quality Enforcement Policy (Enforcement Policy). The Enforcement Policy was approved by the Office of Administrative Law and became effective on May 20, 2010. The Enforcement Policy establishes a methodology for assessing administrative civil liability. Use of the methodology addresses the factors in California Water Code (CWC) section 13385(e), which requires the Central Coast Water Board to consider several factors when determining the amount of civil liability to impose, including “the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation or violations, whether the discharge is susceptible to cleanup or abatement, the degree of toxicity of the discharge, and, with respect to the violator, the ability to pay, the effect on its ability to continue its business, any voluntary cleanup efforts undertaken, any prior history of violations, the degree of culpability, economic benefit or savings, if any, resulting from the violation, and other matters that justice may require.”

The following considerations are based on the procedures included in the Water Quality Enforcement Policy methodology.

### **Discharge Violation**

On October 3, 2012, the Discharger’s chlorination system at the WWTP failed to disinfect the secondarily-treated effluent from 4:08 a.m. to 9:40 a.m., which resulted in an unauthorized discharge of un-disinfected effluent from the WWTP of 297,896 gallons to the Pacific Ocean.

The Discharger reported that the chlorination failure at the WWTP was discovered by a plant operator conducting plant rounds in the morning of October 3, 2012. The Discharger conducted an investigation into the cause of the failure, including the failure of a particular pump, but was unable to conclusively determine the cause of the pump’s failure. The Discharger reported the discharge incident to the Central Coast Water Board and other agencies including the Pre-harvest Shellfish Unit of the Environmental Management Branch of the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and the Santa Barbara County Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) Department.

Section 13385 of the CWC includes provisions for assessing administrative civil liability for discharges of wastes to surface waters in violation of the federal Clean Water Act. The October 3, 2012 discharge incident was to surface waters of the United States for which liability can be assessed in accordance with Section 13385 of the Water Code. Water Code section 13385(c) states, in part, that the Regional Board may impose civil liability administratively for noncompliance with Water code section 13376 on a daily basis at a maximum of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) for each day in which the violation occurs in accordance with Water code section 13385(c)(1); and where there is a discharge, any portion of which is not susceptible to cleanup or is not cleaned up, and

the volume discharged, but not cleaned up, exceeds 1,000 gallons, an additional liability not to exceed ten dollars (\$10) multiplied by the number of gallons by which the volume discharge, but not cleaned up, exceeds 1,000 gallons; or both, Water Code section 13385(c)(2).

The October 3, 2012 discharge was in violation of its NPDES permit, specifically Prohibition III.B, and Standard Provisions as described herein, for which administrative liability may be imposed.

### **Penalty Determination for Discharge Violation**

The following step-by-step calculation is based on the Enforcement Policy's guidelines in determining monetary penalties associated with discharge violations to surface waters of the United States.

#### **Step #1: Potential for Harm**

Potential for harm is evaluated using the scores derived from the following three factors, with a total score of five.

#### **Factor 1: Harm or Potential Harm to Beneficial Uses**

The evaluation of the potential harm to beneficial uses factor considers the harm that may result from exposure to the pollutants in the illegal discharge. The most sensitive beneficial uses for this discharge are Water Contact Recreation (REC-1) and Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL), due to the potential exposure to elevated levels of pathogens (see Factor 2). Fecal contamination in recreational waters is associated with an increased risk of gastrointestinal and respiratory illness.

The outfall for this facility is located 1,000 feet offshore of Carpinteria State Beach in approximately 25 feet of water. Although the effluent is diluted by the diffuser at a 93:1 ratio, the Discharger's analysis indicates that receiving water limitations would be violated outside the initial zone of dilution. This discharge lasted for over 5 ½ hours.

"Below moderate" is defined as:

Less than moderate threat to beneficial uses (i.e., impacts are observed or reasonably expected, harm to beneficial uses is minor).

Due to the above considerations, the board finds the appropriate score for Factor 1 is two for being Below Moderate.

#### **Factor 2: Physical, Chemical, Biological or Thermal Characteristics**

While Factor 1 considers the harm to potential uses that can occur because of where the discharge occurred, Factor 2 considers the characteristics of the discharge itself. The board finds the appropriate score for Factor 2 is two, a moderate risk or threat, because the un-disinfected discharge received secondary biological treatment, but contained elevated levels of pathogens (coliform, enterococcus, etc.). No effluent sampling was conducted during the discharge event, but a representative secondary effluent total coliform sample taken by the Discharger's consultant (Aquatic Bioassay & Consulting Laboratories Inc.) showed 160,000 mpn/100 ml, which is more than 68 times above the effluent limit of 2,300 mpn/100ml.

### **Factor 3: Susceptibility to Cleanup or Abatement**

The board finds the appropriate score for Factor 3 is one, meaning that less than 50% of the discharge was susceptible to cleanup, based on the following justifications:

1. The unauthorized discharge was not known until an operator discovered zero chlorine residual at the front end of the chlorine contact tank (right after chlorination dosage point). This resulted in direct discharge to the Pacific Ocean with none of the discharge susceptible to cleanup or abatement.
2. Discharger has no provision for automated "recirculation" or "emergency storage" system in place in cases of chlorination failure.

### **Step #2: Assessments for Discharge Violations**

The parties stipulated that 297,986 gallons of undisinfected effluent were discharged.

### **Deviation from Requirement**

The deviation from requirement reflects the extent to which the violation deviates from the permit's specific requirement as presented in Table 1 of the Enforcement Policy (page 14). In this case, the board finds the deviation from requirements is Moderate because the intended effectiveness of the requirement to chlorinate has been partially compromised for more than five hours without alarm systems in place to notify operators.

### **Volume Assessment**

Pursuant to Water Code section 13385(a), the Discharger is subject to administrative civil liability for violating any waste discharge requirement contained in an NDPES permit. The Central Coast Water Board may impose administrative civil liability pursuant to Water Code section 13385(c) in an amount not to exceed the sum of both of the following; (1) \$10,000 for each day in which the violation occurred and (2) \$10 for each gallon of discharge that was not susceptible to cleanup or was not cleaned up in excess of 1,000 gallons. The Water Quality Enforcement Policy requires application of the per gallon factor to the maximum per gallon amounts allowed under statute for the violations involved.

The Water Quality Enforcement Policy allows discretion to lower the \$10 per gallon maximum amount to \$2 per gallon for high-volume discharges, including those involving sewage or stormwater. The board exercises its discretion to reduce the penalty to \$2 per gallon to yield an appropriate penalty for the discharge at issue, which did not involve sewage or stormwater.

### **Step #3: Per Day Assessments for Non-Discharge Violations**

This Order does not include any non-discharge violations.

### **Step #4: Adjustment Factors**

The following three factors should be considered for modification of the amount of initial liability:

**Culpability** is scored as 1.1. The Discharger failed to take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment (Order No. R3-2011-003, Attachment D – Standard Provisions I (C) and 40 CFR §122.41(d)) and failed to develop and implement preventative and contingency plans (Attachment D-1, I (B.9)). In particular, Attachment D-1, I (B.9) requires:

Safeguards shall be provided to assure maximal compliance with all terms and conditions of this permit. Safeguards shall include preventative and contingency plans and may also include alternative power sources, stand-by generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other precautions. Preventative and contingency plans for controlling and minimizing the [e]ffect of accidental discharges shall:

- a. identify possible situations that could cause "upset", "overflow" or "bypass", or other noncompliance. (Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.)
- b. evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and describe procedures and steps to minimize or correct any adverse environmental impact resulting from noncompliance with the permit.

At the time of the event, the Discharger's chemical disinfection system did not include a low chlorine dosage alarm system that would have immediately notified plant operators of a chlorination failure and thereby minimize the length of time and volume of the discharge. Even though the pump was well-maintained and had no previous failures, such performance is not a guarantee of future success.

The Discharger was required by its permit to sample for 7 days after the loss of disinfection (see (Monitoring and Reporting Program, VIII.A.2)). Although this failure to conduct sampling could be considered a violation of the Discharger's permit, it is not included in the administrative civil liability assessed by this Order. The Discharger spoke with Central Coast Water Board permitting staff and was allegedly told not to sample after the October 3, 2012 discharge

**Cleanup and Cooperation** is scored as 0.9. After the violation, the Discharger subsequently created an alarm to notify staff in the event of a low chlorine condition. The Discharger originally reported that the October 3, 2012 discharge amount was estimated to be 281,250 gallons. In its 13267 response, based on an assessment of available data, the Discharger's consultant re-estimated the discharge amount as 231.076. However, using effluent data from the Discharger's Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system the Prosecution Team's calculation of the discharge volume was recalculated at 297,896. Based on its subsequent review of the relevant data on SCADA that was not previously available to the Discharger, the Discharger agreed with the discharge volume estimate of 297,896 gallons.

**History of Violations** is scored as 1. Although the Discharger has dechlorination violations, the Discharger does not have previous violations similar to the chlorination system failure. See Attachment B for summary of effluent limit violations that are mandatory minimum penalties, and are not required to go through the discretionary penalty methodology analysis.

#### **Step # 5: Determination of Base Liability**

The total base liability is determined by adding the amounts/scores above (see attached data spreadsheet). In this case, the liability is assessed based on both per day and per gallon penalties.

**Step #6: Ability to Pay and Ability to Continue in Business**

The parties stipulated that the Discharger is capable of paying the liability, therefore the board finds the appropriate score is neutral or one.

**Step #7: Other Factors as Justice may Require**

The table below shows the Prosecution Team’s staff costs, which are added to the liability amount, in accordance with the Enforcement Policy which states, on page 19, “The costs of investigation and enforcement are ‘other factors as justice may require’, and should be added to the liability amount.”

| <b>CARPINTERIA SANITARY DISTRICT MATTER</b> |   |                 |                  |               |
|---|---|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Staff Position                              | Task  | Estimated Hours | Hourly Rate (\$) | Cost (\$)     |
| WRCE1                                       | Site Inspection (prep, travel, onsite meeting/inspection) | 20              | 125              | 2,500         |
| WRCE2                                       | Site Inspection (prep, travel, onsite meeting/inspection) | 20              | 125              | 2,500         |
| WRCE1                                       | Development of Investigative Order (NOV/13267 Letter)     | 12              | 125              | 1,500         |
| WRCE2                                       | Development of Investigative Order (NOV/13267 Letter)     | 12              | 125              | 1,500         |
| Sr WRCE                                     | Review/Approve Investigative Order                        | 5               | 125              | 625           |
| WRCE1                                       | Review Technical Report by Discharger                     | 20              | 125              | 2,500         |
| WRCE2                                       | Review Technical Report by Discharger                     | 20              | 125              | 2,500         |
| WRCE1                                       | Develop draft Attachment A and Penalty Calculator         | 10              | 125              | 1,250         |
| WRCE2                                       | Develop draft Attachment A and Penalty Calculator         | 10              | 125              | 1,250         |
| WRCE1                                       | Technical Meeting by telephone                            | 4               | 125              | 500           |
| WRCE2                                       | Technical Meeting by telephone                            | 4               | 125              | 500           |
| Sr WRCE                                     | Technical Meeting by telephone                            | 3               | 125              | 375           |
| WRCE1                                       | Settlement meeting and discussion                         | 8               | 125              | 1,000         |
| WRCE2                                       | Settlement meeting and discussion                         | 12              | 125              | 1,500         |
| Sr WRCE                                     | Settlement meeting and discussion                         | 5               | 125              | 625           |
| Sr WRCE                                     | Revise Attachment A                                       | 11              | 125              | 1,375         |
|   |   |                 | <b>TOTAL</b>     | <b>22,000</b> |

**Step #8: Economic Benefit**

The economic benefit includes the failure to install a low chlorine dosage alarm system and the failure to conduct water quality monitoring of the receiving water. The following table shows the details of calculated economic benefits based on: (1) cost information provided by Aquatic Bioassay & Consulting Laboratories Inc. for sampling and analysis of receiving water (includes approximate cost of labor and equipment rental for seven days and (2) information provided by Discharger for installation of an alarm system.

| Compliance Action   | One-Time Non-depreciable Expenditure |            | Annual Cost |      | Date of        |            |                 | Benefit of Non-Compliance |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------|-------------|------|----------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
|   | Amount                               | Date       | Amount      | Date | Non-Compliance | Compliance | Penalty Payment |                           |
| Avoided Sampling and Analysis of Receiving Water (outfall) <sup>1</sup> | \$22,400                             | 10/3/2012  | \$0         | --   | 10/3/2012      | 5/28/2014  | 5/28/2015       | \$25,234                  |
| Delayed Installation of Alarm   | \$6,150                              | 10/22/2012 | \$0         | --   | 3/25/2011      | 10/22/2012 | 5/28/2015       | \$300                     |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>\$28,550</b>                      |            | <b>\$0</b>  |      |                |            |                 | <b>\$25,534</b>           |

Source: USEPA BEN Model: Version 5.4.0, 2/23/2015 15:45

Not-for-Profit, which pays no taxes

Cost Index for Inflation: ECI Employment Cost Index

Discount/Compound Rate: 4.8%

<sup>1</sup> Requires 7 days offshore with boat and personnel. Cost: \$3,200 x 7

**Step #9: Maximum and Minimum Liability**

The Enforcement Policy states that the total liability shall be at least 10% higher than the economic benefit. Therefore the minimum liability is \$28,087.40.

The maximum liability allowed by Water Code section 13385 is \$10 per gallon (in excess of 1,000 gallons) plus \$10,000 per day. Therefore the maximum liability is \$3,028,960.

**Step #10: Final Liability Amount**

The final liability amount for the October 3, 2012 discharge, in consideration of the factors discussed above, is **\$81,775**.

## ATTACHMENT B

| Violation Date | Constituent              | Limitation Period | Limit | Result | Units | Percentage Over Limit |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------|--------|-------|-----------------------|
| 12/27/2011     | Settleable Solids        | 7-Day Average of  | 1.5   | 5.89   | mg/L  | 293%                  |
| 12/27/2011     | Settleable Solids        | Daily Maximum     | 3     | 40     | mg/L  | 1233%                 |
| 12/27/2011     | Settleable Solids        | 30-Day Average of | 1     | 1.47   | mg/L  | 47%                   |
| 01/03/2013     | Chlorine, Total Residual | Instantaneous     | 5600  | 10400  | ug/L  | 86%                   |
| 01/07/2013     | Chlorine, Total Residual | Instantaneous     | 5600  | 7800   | ug/L  | 39%                   |