State of California
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
LOS ANGELES REGION

ORDER NO. R4-2003-0156

NPDES NO. CA0059501

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR CAMROSA WATER DISTRICT (Camrosa Water Reclamation Facility)

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Los Angeles Region (Regional Board), finds:

1. On May 15, 2002 Camrosa Water District (hereinafter CWD or Discharger) filed a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) and applied to the Regional Board for reissuance of waste discharge requirements and a permit to discharge tertiary treated wastewater, from its treatment facility located in Camarillo, to the Calleguas Creek, a water of the State and the United States, under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit NPDES No. CA0059501. CWD discharges municipal and industrial wastewater from the Camrosa Water Reclamation Facility (CWRF).

PURPOSE OF THIS ORDER

2. This NPDES Permit regulates the discharge of treated wastewater to Calleguas Creek, a water of the State and the United States. This discharge was previously permitted by Waste Discharge Requirements in Order No. 2000-09, adopted by this Regional Board on January 26, 2000. This Order is a re-issuance of the waste discharge requirements that have been revised to reflect current wastewater treatment processes and to include additional findings, effluent limitations, prohibitions, updated standard provisions, and an expanded monitoring and reporting program.

FACILITY AND TREATMENT PROCESS DESCRIPTION

3. CWRF is a publicly owned treatment works (POTW) and CWD operates the CWRF, located at 1900 Lewis Road, Camarillo, California. CWRF has a design capacity of 1.5 million gallons per day (mgd) and serves an approximate population of 16,000 people. In 1995, CWD began making modifications and upgrades to its wastewater treatment plant. In April 1997, the new facilities were placed into service. Since then, CWRF provides tertiary treatment to municipal and industrial wastewater. Current treatment consists of a bar screen, headworks lift station, Eimco© Carousel denitIR© extended aeration system, anoxic denitrification, secondary clarification, Parkson upflow sand filtration, chlorination, and impoundment for reclamation. Biosolids from the secondary clarifiers are impounded, dried in sludge drying beds at the plant, and transported to a land application projects in La Paz County, Arizona.

Figures 1 and 2 show the location of the plant and the schematic of wastewater flow.

4. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and Regional Board has classified CWRF as a major Discharger. CWRF has a Threat to Water Quality Category of 3 and a Complexity Rating of A, or a combined rating of 3-A.

5. **Water Recycling Facility.** Treated effluent from CWRF is currently used for irrigation of various crops, with the remainder of the excess flows directed to off-site evaporation/percolation ponds. At an average daily flow of 1.3 MGD, the facility generates 474.5 million gallons of tertiary filtered disinfected effluent on an annual basis. Presently 54% of the total production, or approximately 254 MGD of the effluent produced at the CWRF is used for irrigation of 1,011 acres of various crops. The CWD is currently in the process of evaluating other options for year-round effluent reuse.

   Future beneficial reuse applications include irrigation of highway medians, golf courses and landscapes, as well as, direct and non-direct food chain crops. Other reclaimed water applications may include dust control water, wash-down water and fire protection water. The production, distribution and reuse of recycled water for direct, non-potable applications are presently regulated under Water Reclamation Requirements (WRRs) Order No. 95 - 059, adopted by this Board on May 15, 1995.

6. **Storm Water Management.** Storm water from the CWRF and does not leave the property and is captured in a storm water retention basin. CWD has a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). CWD has filed a Notice of Intent (NOI) and implements a SWPPP, to comply with the general NPDES permit for storm water discharges associated with industrial activity. Those storm water requirements shall be incorporated into this Order.

DISCHARGE AND RECEIVING WATER DESCRIPTION

7. Treated effluent is typically reclaimed and used for irrigation of various food crops, while any unused effluent is discharged into four storage ponds under separate Waste Discharge Requirements contained in Order No. 95-059. The discharge of treated effluent to surface waters occurs during rainy periods only, when there is little or no demand for irrigation water and the storage ponds are at or nearing their storage capacity. Treated effluent from the storage ponds, which have a detention time prior to discharge of at least 40 days, is discharged to Calleguas Creek only when irrigation demands are minimal, through Discharge Serial No. 001 (Latitude 34°10'53", Longitude 119°01'43"). The discharge outfall is located at Pond #2. Calleguas Creek is a tributary to Mugu Lagoon, and is part of the Calleguas Creek Watershed Management Area. Since 1998 there have been no discharges to the Creek.

   Upstream of discharge, there are many tributaries to Calleguas Creek and Conejo Creek is one of the major tributary that joins the Calleguas Creek. For most of the length of the Conejo and Calleguas Creeks, the sides of the channel are rip-rapped, but the bottom is unlined. A number of agricultural and industrial drains serve as conveyance for agricultural and industrial drainage water to the Calleguas Creek estuary and Mugu Lagoon. Therefore, 18 months receiving water monitoring data showed exceedances for some of the pesticides.

8. Proposed new discharge location. CWD proposes to relocate its discharge outfall on Calleguas Creek to a new location, approximately 2.3 miles downstream of the existing one, and plans to abandon the existing outfall. With the relocation, CWD is also considering the irrigation use of recycled water for an additional 1,000 acres of agricultural land, thereby reducing further the likelihood of discharge to Calleguas Creek.

   The proposed outfall location (Latitude 34" 09' 49", Longitude 119" 03' 42") is located in Calleguas Creek, south of the Hueneme Road Bridge (Potrero Road Bridge). While the Basin Plan contains no specific mineral objectives for this Reach, depending on this discharge location in relation to tidal influence, there may be beneficial uses that would be affected by mineral discharges that would have to be considered in the permitting process.

   A review of CEQA documentation and assessment studies on the projected impacts, if any, of the discharge on the receiving water at the new location is required. A baseline assessment of the potential impacts on the beneficial uses, including aquatic and wildlife habitats, will also be required prior to discharge at this location.

   When the new discharge location is approved, the permit will be reopened to incorporate the new discharge point and its findings.

DISCHARGE QUALITY

9. There have been no discharges to Calleguas Creek since 1998. All the treated wastewater has been used for recycling purposes. Therefore, effluent water quality monitoring has not been conducted since 1998. However, CWD has performed 18 months interim monitoring on the samples collected from the Pond #2 where the discharge outfall is located. Reasonable Potential Analysis (RPA) was performed on the priority pollutant data submitted to Board, to determine if effluent limits are warranted. RPA is discussed later in the permit in the RPA section.

   To evaluate the treatment plant performance, staff reviewed the WRRs reports. Review of the last five years of Annual Reports submitted (as required in WRRs, Order No. 95-059) reveals that CWD has consistently met the prescribed limits for conventional and non-conventional pollutants, except for chloride.

   The following table contains the effluent discharge quality as reported in the 2002 Annual Report for WRR.

Constituents	Unit	Maximum (Monthly Average)	Minimum (Monthly Average)	Annual Average
BOD	mg/L	12.7	0.2	6.4
TDS	mg/L	877	712	793
Turbidity	mg/L	4	1.1	2.25
TSS	ml/L	0.1	0.1	0.1
Oil & Grease	mg/L	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5

Constituents	Unit	Maximum (Monthly Average)	Minimum (Monthly Average)	Annual Average
Ammonia-N	mg/L	0.3	0.2	0.22
Nitrate-N	mg/L	3	1	1.9
Nitrite-N	mg/L	0.1	0.1	0.1
Chloride	mg/L	218	175	199
Sulfate	mg/L	154	42	135
Fluoride	mg/L	0.22	0	0.15
Boron	mg/L	0.83	0.12	0.35
Interim Monitoring Results: The following are the priority pollutants that are detected above criteria and have limits.				
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	ug/L	1.9	1	1.3
Cholordibromomethane	ug/L	73	3	26.5
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/L	62	4	28
Lindane	ug/L	0.43	0.43	0.43
Copper	ug/L	33	3	10.25
Cyanide	ug/L	8.5	8.5	8.5
4,4' – DDE	ug/L	0.04	0.02	0.03
4,4' – DDT	ug/L	0.03	0.01	0.02
Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	ug/L	14	1	2.68
Lead	ug/L	18.6	0.5	2.38
Mercury	ug/L	0.2	0.02	0.06

The "<" symbol indicates that the pollutant was not detected (ND) at that concentration level. It is unknown if the pollutant is present at a lower concentration.

Rest of the priority pollutants were non-detect or not detected above their respective criteria.

The Discharger has not monitored for toxicity in the effluent since 1998, as there were no discharges to the Callegaus Creek. However, the circumstances warranting a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation when there is reasonable potential were under review by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) in SWRCB/OCC Files A-1496 & A-1496(a) [Los Coyotes/Long Beach Petitions]. On September 16, 2003, at a public hearing, the State Board adopted Order No. WQO 2003-0012, deferring the issue of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations until Phase II of the SIP is adopted. In the mean time, the State Board replaced the numeric chronic toxicity limit with a narrative effluent limitation and a 1 TUc trigger, in the Long Beach and Los Coyotes WRP NPDES permits. This permit contains a similar narrative chronic toxicity effluent limitation and trigger. This Order also contains a reopener to allow the Regional Board to modify the permit, if necessary, consistent with any new policy, law, or regulation.

APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

10. ***Federal Clean Water Act***. The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) provides that no person may discharge pollutants from a point source into a water of the United States, except in conformance with an NPDES permit. NPDES permits establish effluent limitations that incorporate various requirements of the CWA designed to protect and enhance water quality. CWA section 402 authorizes the USEPA or states with an approved NPDES program to issue NPDES permits. The state of California has an approved NPDES program.

11. **Sources of Drinking Water Policy.** On May 19, 1988, the State Board adopted Resolution No. 88-63, *Sources of Drinking Water Policy (SODW)*, which required all Regional Boards to designate all surface and groundwater, with limited exemptions, as suitable or potentially suitable for municipal and domestic supply. 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).*

12. **Potential Municipal and Domestic Supply (P*).** To implement Regional Board Resolution No. 89-03 and State Board Resolution No. 88-63, in the 1994 the Basin Plan, the Regional Board designated all inland surface and ground waters in the region as existing, intermittent, and potential Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN). The potential designation is conditioned that no new effluent limitations will be placed in WDRs until the Regional Board has undertaken a detailed review of the criteria for exempting a water body from the SODW policy, and adopts a Basin Plan Amendment to finalize the designation.

    This permit is consistent with the foregoing provision of the Basin Plan.

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

14. **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, as amended on January 27, 1997, by Regional Board Resolution No. 97-02. This updated and consolidated plan represents the Board's master 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 groundwater, (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 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 pertinent water quality policies and regulations. The 1994 update of the Basin Plan has been prepared to be consistent with all State and Regional Board plans and policies adopted from 1994 and earlier. This Order implements the plans, policies and provisions of the Regional Board' s Basin Plan.

15. **Beneficial Uses.** The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives and beneficial uses for the Calleguas Creek and contiguous waters.

A. The beneficial uses of the receiving surface water are:

(Calleguas Creek - Hydro Unit 403.11)
- potential: municipal and domestic supply[1] (P*); and,
- existing: agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, freshwater replenishment, contact and non-contact water recreation, warm freshwater habitat, cold freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, rare, threatened or endangered species, and wetland habitat;

(Calleguas Creek Estuary - Hydro Unit 403.11)
- potential: navigation, water contact recreation;
- existing: non-contact water recreation, commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, wildlife habitat, rare, threatened or endangered species, migration of aquatic organisms, spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, and wetland habitat;

(Mugu Lagoon - Hydro Unit 403.11)
- potential: water contact recreation;
- existing: navigation, non-contact water recreation, commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, marine habitat, wildlife habitat, preservation of biological habitats, rare, threatened or endangered species, migration of aquatic organisms, spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, shellfish harvesting, and wetland habitat.

A. There is the potential for public contact in the receiving water downstream of the discharge, therefore, the quality of wastewater discharged to the Calleguas Creek and to the Calleguas Creek Estuary must be such that no public health hazard is created.

B. The beneficial uses of the receiving groundwater are:

Calleguas Creek – Pleasant Valley

Confined Aquifer

Existing: municipal and domestic supply[2], industrial service supply, industrial

[1] 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 uses and at this time cannot establish effluent limitations designed to protect the conditional designation.

process supply, and agricultural supply.

Unconfined and Perched Aquifer

Existing: industrial service supply, industrial process supply, and agricultural supply.

Potential:. municipal and domestic supply[2]

16. **Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations**. The California Department of Health Services establishes primary and secondary maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for inorganic and organic chemicals and radioactive contaminants in drinking water. These MCLs are codified in Title 22, California Code of Regulations. The Basin Plan (Chapter 3) incorporates Title 22 primary MCLs by reference. This incorporation by reference is prospective including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect. Title 22 primary MCLs have been used as bases for effluent limitations in WDRs and NPDES permits to protect the groundwater recharge beneficial use when the receiving groundwater is designated as MUN. Also, the Basin Plan specifies the "Ground waters shall not contain taste or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses." Therefore the secondary MCL's, which are limits based on aesthetic, organoleptic standards, are also incorporated into this permit to protect groundwater quality.

17. **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, CWA section 304(d)(4)(B) and 40 CFR section 131.12 require all NPDES permitting actions to be consistent with the federal antidegradation policy. Both state and federal antidegradation policies require that where the quality of the waters exceed levels necessary to support the beneficial uses, that quality shall be maintained and protected unless allowing lower water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social development, and provided the lower water quality is adequate to support the existing beneficial uses.

18. **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 waterways. 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 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

[2] Effluent limits are prescribed to protect the groundwater recharge beneficial use designation.

available on highly exposed subpopulations in California supports the need to protect the general population at the10^{-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 this 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.

19. **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, adopted on April 26, 2000, and the Office of Administrative Law approved the SIP as amended on April 28, 2000. The SIP applies to discharges of toxic pollutants to inland surface waters, enclosed bays and estuaries of California that 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:

a. implementation procedures for the CTR priority pollutants criteria and for priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Boards in their Basin Plans;
b. monitoring requirements for priority pollutants with insufficient data to determine reasonable potential;
c. monitoring requirements for 2,3,7,8–TCDD equivalents; and,
d. chronic toxicity control.

20. ***303(d) Listed Pollutants.*** On July 25, 2003, USEPA approved the State's updated list of impaired waterbodies. The list (hereinafter referred to as the 303(d) List) was prepared in accordance with Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act to identify specific impaired waterbodies where water quality standards are not expected to be met after implementation of technology-based effluent limitations on point sources.

<u>Calleguas Creek Reach 1 (was Magu Lagoon on 1998 303(d) list) is on the 303(d) List.</u>
The following pollutants/stressors, from point and non-point sources, were identified as impacting the receiving waters:
- chloradane (tissue), copper, DDT tissue and sediment), endosulfan (tissue), mercury, nickel, nitrogen, PCBs (tissue), sediment toxicity, sedimentation/siltation and zinc.

<u>Calleguas Creek Reach2 (estuary to Potrero Rd- was Calleguas Creek Reaches 1 and 2 on 1998 303(d) list).</u>
The following pollutants/stressors, from point and non-point sources, were identified as impacting the receiving waters:
- ammonia, ChemA (tissue) chlordane, copper, DDT (tissue & sediment), endosulfan (tissue), fecal coliform, nitrogen, PCBs (tissue), sediment toxicity, sedimentation/siltation, toxaphene (tissue & sediment).

The Regional Board revised the 303(d) list in 2002 and submitted the draft to the Sate

Board for approval. The State Board had scheduled the draft 303(d) list, dated October 15, 2002, for approval at two of its meetings, however the interim was postponed to hold additional workshops and to allow more time for the public to submit comments. The draft 303(d) list dated October 15, 2002, was revised on January 13, 2002, was adopted by the State Board at its February 4, 2003 meeting. The adopted 303(d) list was approved by USEPA on July 25, 2003.

21. ***Relevant 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. 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 chloride in Calleguas Creek must be completed by March 2002; nutrients by March 2002; pesticides, historic pesticides, and PCBs by March 2005; and metals by 2006. The remaining TMDLs, such as sulfates are tentatively scheduled for completion in the 2003/2004 fiscal year.

Chloride TMDL and Chloride Limits. On March 22, 2002, the consent decree deadline for the establishment of a chloride TMDL, USEPA Region 9 established the Calleguas Creek Total Maximum Daily Load for chloride. Subsequently, on October 17, 2002, the State Board adopted Order WQO 2002-0017, in the matter of the petition of the City of Simi Valley, City of Thousand Oaks, Camarillo Sanitary District, Camrosa Water District, and Ventura County Waterworks District No. 1, which provided a stay, maintaining the 190 mg/L chloride interim effluent limitation of prior Regional Board resolutions and contained in the existing NPDES permits (Order No. 2000-09 for the CWRF), for the aforementioned POTWs. Following the adoption of NPDES Order No. 2003-XXXX, and concurrent rescission of Order No. 2000-09, the Discharger may file a stipulation for Future Order Issuing Stay, which would modify Order No. WQO 2002-0017, extending the 190 mg/L chloride stay for the duration of NPDES Order No. 2003-XXXX. Consistent with the State Board' s stay, upon expiration of the stay, the accompanying Order or its successors may be reopened and modified to include appropriate final effluent limits for chloride.

Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects TMDL. On October 24, 2002, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 2002-017, Amendment to the Basin Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Include a TMDL for Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects in Calleguas Creek *(Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects* TMDL). The State Board approved the *Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects* TMDL on March 19, 2003. The Office of Administrative Law approved it on June 5, 2003 and USEPA on June 20, 2003 respectively.

22. **Watershed Approach.** This Regional Board has been implementing a Watershed Management Approach (WMA) to address water quality protection in the Los Angeles Region as detalied in the Watershed Management Initiative (WMI). The WMI is designed to integrate various surface and ground water regulatory programs while promoting cooperative, collaborative efforts within a watershed. It is also designed to

focus limited resources on key issues and use sound science. Information about Calleguas Creek Watershed and other watersheds in the region can be obtained from the Regional Board's web site at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb4/ and clicking on the word "Watersheds". 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.

Pursuant to this Regional Board's watershed initiative framework, the Calleguas Creek Watershed Management Area was the targeted watershed for fiscal year 2001-2002. However, the NPDES permit renewals were re-scheduled so that provisions of the CTR and SIP could be incorporated into the permits.

23. There is public contact in the downstream areas; hence, the quality of treated effluents discharged to Calleguas Creek and its tributaries must be such that no health hazard is created.

REGULATORY BASIS FOR EFFLUENT LIMITS AND DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

24. ***Water Quality Objectives and Effluent Limits***. Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) and effluent limitations in this permit are based on:

- The State Water Resources Control Board's "Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California" (the State Implementation Plan or SIP);
- 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;
- Administrative Procedures Manual and Administrative Procedure Updates;
- California Toxics Rule (Federal Register Volume 65, No. 97);
- 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 Regulations
  - Federal Clean Water Act, and
  - 40 CFR Parts 122, 131, among others; and,
- Best professional judgment (pursuant to 40 CFR 122.44).

Where numeric effluent limitations have not been established in the Basin Plan, 40 CFR Part 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.

25. USEPA 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);

- 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).

26. ***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 both mass and concentration limits for some constituents; however, the mass-based limits are inappropriate during wet weather flows when plant flows may exceed design capacity. Therefore, during storm events when flows exceed design capacity, only concentration-based limits are applicable.

27. ***Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations.*** Pursuant to 40 CFR section 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 for certain pollutants 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 section 122.45(d)(1), are included in the permit for certain constituents as discussed in the Fact Sheet accompanying this Order.

28. ***Sewage Sludge.*** To implement Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act, USEPA promulgated 40 CFR Part 503 on February 19, 1993, to regulate the use and disposal of municipal sewage sludge. This regulation was amended on September 3, 1999. The regulation requires that producers of sewage sludge meet certain reporting, handling, and disposal requirements. It is the responsibility of the Discharger to comply with said regulations that are enforceable by USEPA, because California has not been delegated the authority to implement this program.

The State Board, however, under the authority of the Water Code adopted a statewide general WDRs for the generation, transport, and discharge of biosolids (Order No. 2000-10-DWQ). Other regional boards, particularly those where biosolids are land applied also

adopted general WDRs for disposal of biosolids. It is the responsibility of the Discharger to comply with the applicable WDRs.

29. ***Storm Water.*** Section 402(p) of the Federal Clean Water Act, 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 Part 122.26, which established requirements for storm water discharges under an NPDES program. To facilitate compliance with federal regulations, in 1992 the State Board issued a statewide general permit [NPDES No. CAS000001, reissued on April 17, 1997] to regulate storm water discharges associated with industrial activity applicable to POTWs with a design flow of one mgd or greater.

30. ***Clean Water Act Effluent Limitations***. Effluent limitations and toxic effluent standards 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.

31. ***Antibacksliding***. 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)(2) outlines six exceptions where effluent limitations may be relaxed. Refer to the fact sheet for a more detailed discussion.

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

    The Basin Plan includes narrative and numeric WQOs. The CTR promulgates numeric aquatic life criteria for 23 priority toxic pollutants and numeric human health criteria for 57 priority toxic pollutants. A compliance schedule provision in 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 Part 122.44(d) specifies that water quality based effluent limits may be set based on USEPA criteria and supplemented, where necessary, by site specific characteristics and other relevant information to attain and maintain narrative water quality criteria to fully protect designated beneficial uses.

33. ***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 man-made 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.

34. ***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 USEPA develop secondary treatment standards for POTWs as defined in Section 304(d)(1). Based on this statutory requirement, USEPA 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 attainable by secondary treatment in terms of five-day biochemical oxygen demand, total suspended solids, and pH.

35. ***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 still 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 POTWs from additional regulation to protect water quality standards. As a result, POTWs are also subject to WQBELs. Applicable water quality standards for Calleguas Creek are contained in the Basin Plan and CTR, as described in previous findings.

The WQBELs in this Order are based on the numeric and narrative water quality objectives (WQOs) in the 1994 Basin Plan as amended, the CTR criteria, Title 22 MCLs, effluent limits in the previous permit, and/or best professional judgment (BPJ) pursuant to Part 122.44. The CTR is comprised of numeric aquatic life criteria for 23 toxic pollutants and human health criteria for 57 toxic pollutants. Federal regulations require that the most stringent of the State and federal criteria/objectives shall be applied to best protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

40 CFR section 122.44(d)(vi)(A) requires the establishment of effluent limitations to attain and maintain applicable narrative water quality criteria to protect the designated beneficial uses. WQBELs may be set based on USEPA criteria and supplemented, where necessary, by other relevant information to attain and maintain the narrative water quality criteria to fully protect the designated beneficial uses.

The CTR and the SIP authorize the State to issue compliance schedules in the permit for new or revised NPDES permit limits based on the CTR criteria, when certain conditions are met.

36. ***Water Quality Based Effluent Limits for Toxic Pollutants.*** Toxic substances are

regulated in this permit by water quality based effluent limitations derived from the 1994 Basin Plan, the CTR, and/or best professional judgment (BPJ) pursuant to Part 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 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. If final limits are needed, the permit will be reopened and limits will be included in the permit.

37. ***Mixing Zones and Dilution Credits.*** Mixing zone and dilution credits were not allowed in the calculation of the WQBELs in this Order. While the 1994 Basin Plan and the 2000 SIP provide for mixing zones on a case by case basis, there are criteria that have to be complied with before a mixing zone is allowed. One of the criteria in the Basin Plan is that, for rivers and streams, the mixing zone cannot extend more than 250 feet downstream of the discharge point. The Basin Plan also points out that for most inland streams in the region, upstream flows are minimal and mixing zones are usually not appropriate. In calculating year-round mixing zone and dilution credits, the SIP requires the use of critical stream flow data for acute (1Q10) and chronic (7Q10) aquatic life criteria. 1Q10 is the lowest flow that occurs for one day and 7Q10 is the average low flow that occurs for seven consecutive days, with statistical frequencies of once every 10 years.

The Regional Board has concluded mixing zones and dilution credits would be inappropriate to grant, at this time, in light of the following factors:

- the receiving water primarily consists of nuisance flows and other effluents, limiting its ability to assimilate additional waste;
- Several reaches of Conejo Creek, Calleguas Creek, and Mugu Lagoon [including those subject to this Order] are 303(d) listed (i.e, impaired) for certain constituents;
- 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;
- There are no extensive flow information available at a location immediately upstream of the discharge point to be considered for mixing zone studies (1Q10 and 7 Q 10 data);
- 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.

38. ***Ammonia Limits.*** The ammonia in the 1994 Basin Plan were revised by Regional Board Resolution No. 2002-011, adopted on April 28, 2002, to be consistent with the 1999 USEPA update on ammonia criteria. Regional Board Resolution No. 2002-011 was approved by State Board, OAL and USEPA on April 30, 2003, June 5, 2003, and June

19, 2003, respectively and is now in effect. The final effluent limitations for ammonia prescribed in this Order are based on the revised ammonia criteria and Waste Load Allocation (WLA) prescribed in the ammonia TMDL for Calleguas Creek and, apply at the end of pipe.

REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

39. ***Reasonable Potential Analyses for Toxic Pollutants.*** As specified in 40 CFR Part 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include limits for all pollutants that 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 that 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, Regional Board staff have conducted Reasonable Potential Analyses (RPA) on priority pollutants using the Discharger's monitoring data and other available information regarding the discharge and receiving water. Attachment R summarizes the results of RPA; and where available, the lowest adjusted criteria (C_a) the maximum effluent concentrations (MECs), and the calculated effluent limits.

a. ***RPA Data.*** CWD did not discharge to Calleguas Creek since 1998. Therefore, no regular NPDES discharge data is available. However, Regional Board staff used priority pollutant data from 18 months Interim Monitoring Reports for effluent and ambient water, in the RPAs.

Chronic Toxicity - Consistent with SIP section 4, the Order contains a narrative effluent limitation for Chronic Toxicity. The circumstances warranting a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation when there is reasonable potential were reviewed by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) in SWRCB/OCC Files A-1496(a) [Los Coyotes/Long Beach Petitions]. On September 16, 2003, the State Board adopted Order No. WQO 2003-0012, deferring the numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations until the adoption of Phase II of the SIP, and replaced the numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation with a narrative effluent limitation for the time being.

b. ***Interim Monitoring.*** In accordance with the SIP and pursuant to Water Code section 13267, the Regional Board required the Discharger to conduct monthly interim monitoring of priority pollutants (except for asbestos and 2,3,7,8-TCDD) in the effluent and receiving water. Monitoring for asbestos and 2,3,7,8-TCDD is semiannual. The goal is to obtain an adequate number of data points for statistical analyses. Interim monitoring started in July 2001 and completed in December 2002. Results of interim monitoring are reported to the Regional Board on a quarterly basis. Interim monitoring data from July 2001 to December 2002 were used in the RPAs.

c. ***Reasonable Potential Determination.*** Section 1.3 of the SIP details the procedure in conducting a RPA. The preliminary steps involve the following:

i. Identifying the lowest or most stringent criterion or water quality objective for the pollutant (C);

ii. Adjusting the selected criterion/objective (Ca), when appropriate, for hardness, pH, and translators of the receiving water. For this permit, the hardness used was 364 mg/L as $CaCO_3$. Ambient hardness ranged from 325 to 406 mg/L averaging 364. The SIP only allows a freshwater maximum hardness of 400 mg/L as $CaCO_3$.

iii. Collating the appropriate effluent data for the pollutant;

iv. Determining the observed maximum concentration in the effluent (MEC) from the effluent data; and

v. Determining the observed maximum ambient background concentration of the pollutant (B).

There are three tiers in determining reasonable potential:

- For the first tier, the MEC is compared with the adjusted lowest applicable water quality objective or criterion (C_a). If the pollutant was not detected in any samples and the reported detection limits were below C_a, the lowest detection limit is used as the MEC. If the MEC is greater than C_a, then there is reasonable potential for the constituent to cause or contribute to an excursion above C_a and a WQBEL must be prescribed. If the MEC is less than C_a or if the pollutant were not detected in any of the effluent samples and all of the reported detection limits were greater than or equal to C_a, proceed with Tier 2.

- For the second tier, if the MEC is less than C_a or if the pollutant was not detected in any of the effluent samples and all of the detection limits were greater than or equal to C_a, then the observed maximum ambient background concentration (B) of the pollutant is compared with C_a. If B is greater than C_a, then a WQBEL is required. If B is less than C_a, proceed to Tier 3.

- For the third tier, other information available, such as the CWA 303(d) List and fish advisories, is reviewed to determine RPA, Section 1.3 of the SIP describes the type of information that can be considered in Tier 3. If the review indicates the need for a WQBEL to protect the beneficial uses, regardless of the results of Tier 1 and Tier 2, a WQBEL is prescribed.

d. When reasonable potential exists, WQBELs are calculated, following procedures in SIP. However, if the pollutant has an MCL, Regional Board staff compares the WQBEL with the MCL-based WQBEL and selects the more stringent of the two as the limit.

40. The following toxic pollutants exhibited reasonable potentials to exceed their respective most stringent water quality objective or criterion, therefore, WQBELS are prescribed in this Order:

- detected in the effluent with concentrations above criteria; copper, cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, chlorodibromomethane and gamma–BHC; and
- detected in receiving water with concentrations above criteria; lead, mercury, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, 4,4'-DDE and 4,4'-DDT.

WQBELS for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is based on Title 22, MCLs, and the others are based on the CTR criteria.

TCDD was detected once in the receiving water, and CWD is required to monitor for TCDD both in the effluent and receiving water on a semi annual basis and submit the results to Regional Board for evaluation.

41. ***Pollutant Minimization Program and Toxicity.*** For some priority pollutants, the applicable water quality objectives or criteria are below the levels that current technology can measure. Section 2.4.5 of the SIP provides how compliance will be determined in those cases. This Order requires the Discharger to conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program, as described in section 2.4.5.1, when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation. The Discharger is also required to work with its laboratory to lower detection levels. Also, to determine the impact of pollutants that could not be measured by current technology and the synergistic effect of all pollutants, this Order prescribes toxicity effluent limitations.

42. ***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) that will specify wasteload allocations (WLAs) for point sources and load allocations (LA) for nonpoint sources. Following Regional Board adoption of the TMDLs, this Order may be reopened to include the results of the TMDLs. In the absence of a TMDL, the permits will include WQBELs derived as provided in the CTR, SIP, and other applicable guidance using best professional judgment. These WQBELs are applied at end-of-pipe but not at the end of treatment from which the effluent from the treatment plant is discharged to percolation ponds. The treated effluent is discharged to four off-site percolation ponds, located and adjacent to the Calleguas Creek. When the ponds reach capacity, the effluent is discharged from the last pond (#2) to the Calleguas Creek.

43. This 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 or level of treatment. As a result, both the quantity and quality of the discharge are expected to remain the same consistent with 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.

44. The requirements contained in this Order were developed in accordance with the foregoing laws, regulations, plans, policies, and guidance and procedures. Specific effluent limitations for each constituent were derived using best professional judgment and are based on the Basin Plan; Federal and State water quality criteria, plans, policies, and guidelines; and plant performance. The specific methodology and example calculations are documented in the fact sheet prepared by Regional Board staff that accompanies this Order. As they are met, the requirements will protect and maintain the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

INTERIM LIMITS

45. 40 CFR Part 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. However, the SIP does allow inclusion of an interim limit within an NPDES permit for priority pollutants if the limit for the priority pollutant is CTR-based, and if the previous permit did not contain an effluent limit for that priority pollutant.

46. The CWRF may not be able to achieve immediate compliance with the limits for copper, cyanide, chlorodibromethane, dichlorobromomethane and gamma-BHC contained in Section I.A.2.b. Data submitted in discharge interim monitoring reports indicate that these constituents have been detected in the effluent, at least once, at a concentration greater than the new limits proposed in this Order. Therefore, Interim limits for Copper, Cyanide, dichlorobromomethane, chlorodibromomethane, gamma – BHC are prescribed in this Order.

    Lead, mercury, 4,4'-DDE, 4,4'-DDT and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate were detected in the receiving water at least once, at a concentration above their respective criteria requiring final effluent limits. As these constituents can meet the prescribed limits in the treated effluent, these pollutants do not need interim limits.

    Camrosa may not be able to meet the Waste Load Allocation prescribed in the adopted chloride TMDL for Calleguas Creek. Therefore, an interim limit is prescribed. A daily maximum limit of 190 mg/L is prescribed as an interim limit for chloride in the accompanying Time Schedule Order (TSO).

    The monthly average interim effluent limit for chloride is consistent with State Board adopted Order WQO 2002-0017, which provided a stay, known as 'chloride stay" maintaining the 190 mg/L chloride interim effluent limit.

47. The limitations contained in this Order are intended to protect and maintain existing and potential beneficial uses of the receiving waters. Environmental benefits provided by these limitations are reasonable and necessary.

CEQA AND NOTIFICATION

48. The action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §21100, et. seq.) in accordance with California Water Code §13389.

49. The Regional Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to renew waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.

50. The Regional Board, in a public hearing, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge and to the tentative requirements.

51. This Order shall serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit pursuant to §402 of the Federal Clean Water Act, or amendments thereto, and is effective 50 days from the date of adoption because of significant public comment, in accordance with federal law, provided the Regional Administrator, USEPA, has no objections.

52. Pursuant to California Water Code Section 13320, any aggrieved party may seek review of this Order by filing a petition with the State Board. A petition must be sent to the State Water Resources Control Board, P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, California, 95812, within 30 days of adoption of the Order.

53. The requirements contained in this Order are based on the Basin Plan, USEPA National Recommended Water Quality Criteria, other Federal and State plans, policies, guidelines, and best engineering judgement, and, as they are met, will be in conformance with the goals of the aforementioned water quality control plans and will protect and maintain existing beneficial uses of the receiving water.

54. The issuance of waste discharge requirements for this discharge is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code (California Environmental Quality Act) in accordance with Water Code Section 13389.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Camrosa Water District, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

I. DISCHARGE LIMITATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations

1. Waste discharged shall be limited to treated municipal wastewater only, as proposed.

2. The discharge of an effluent from Discharge Serial No. 001 with constituents in excess of the following limits is prohibited:

   a. Conventional and nonconventional pollutants:

		Discharge Limitations		
Constituents	Units	Monthly Average [1/]	Weekly Average [1/]	Daily Maximum [2/]
Settleable Solids	mL/L	0.1	----	0.3
BOD_5 (20°C)	mg/L	30	45	---
	lbs/day[3/]	375	563	---

Discharge Limitations

Constituents	Units	Monthly Average [1/]	Weekly Average [1/]	Daily Maximum [2/]
Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	----
	lbs/day[3/]	375	563	----
Oil and Grease	mg/L	10	----	15
	lbs/day[3/]	125	----	187
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	850	----	----
	lbs/day[3/]	10633	----	----
Sulfate	mg/L	250	----	----
	lbs/day[3/]	3127	----	----
Chloride	lbs/day	----	----	1500[4/]
Boron	mg/L	1.0	----	----
	lbs/day[3/]	12.5	----	----
Fluoride	mg/L	1.2	----	----
	lbs/day[3/]	15	----	----
Total residual chlorine	mg/L	----	----	0.1 [5/]
	lbs/day	----	----	1.25
Detergents (as MBAS)	mg/L	0.5	----	----
	lbs/day[3/]	6.25	----	----
Nitrate-Nitrogen plus Nitrite-Nitrogen	mg/L	----	----	9[6/]
	lbs/day[3/]	----	----	112
Nitrate-N	mg/L	----	----	9[6/]
	lbs/day[3/]	----	----	112
Nitrite-N	mg/L	-----	----	0.9[6/]
	lbs/day[3/]	-----	----	11.2
Total ammonia	mg/L	3.0[6/]		7.2[6/]
	lbs/day[3/]	-----		33[6/] (WLA)
	mg/L	[7/]	----	[8/]

1/ Average Monthly Discharge Limitation means the highest allowable average of daily discharge over a

calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measures during that month divided by the number of days on which monitoring was performed.

Average Weekly Discharge Limitation means the highest allowable average of daily discharge over a calendar week, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measures during that week divided by the number of days on which monitoring was performed.

2/ 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.

3/ Based on the plant design flow rate of 1.5 mgd. During events such as storms in which the flow exceeds the design capacity, the mass discharge rate limitations will be tabulated using the concentration limits and the actual flow rates.

4/ This is the waste load allocation (WLA) under routine and draught conditions, according to the Chloride TMDL promulgated by USEPA on March 22, 2002.

5/ For total residual chlorine, this is the instantaneous maximum effluent limitation.

6/ This is the waste load allocation, according to the *Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects TMDL* adopted by the Regional Board on October 24, 2002, and will supercede any previously applicable effluent limitations for this Nitrogen constituent. OAL and U.S. EPA approved the *Nitrogen Compounds and Related Effects TMDL*, on June 5, 2003 and June 20, 2003 respectively.

7/ Discharger must comply with the updated ammonia water quality objectives in the Basin Plan, Table 3-3 (Attachment H) which resulted from Resolution No. 2002-001 adopted by the Regional Board on April 25, 2002.

For compliance with Criteria Continuous Concentration (CCC) is the Attachment H, the pH and temperature samples collected in the receiving water downstream of the discharge and the ammonia nitrogen sample collected in the effluent, shall be taken and reported at the same time. Shall there be no receiving water present, the pH and temperature of the effluent at the end of pipe shall be determined and reported.

8/ Discharger must comply with the updated ammonia water quality objectives in the Basin Plan Table 3-1 (Attachment H) which resulted from Resolution No. 2002-011 adopted by the Regional Board on April 25, 2002.

For compliance with Criteria Maximum Concentration (CMC) is the Attachment H, the pH sample collected in the receiving water downstream of the discharge and the ammonia nitrogen sample collected in the effluent, shall be taken and reported at the same time. Shall there be no receiving water present, the pH of the effluent at the end of pipe shall be determined and reported.

b. Toxic pollutants:

			Discharge Limitations[4/]	
CTR #	Constituent	Units	Monthly Average[1/]	Daily Maximum[2/]
68	Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	µg/L	4[6/]	-------
		lbs/day[3]	0.05	-------
6	Copper[5]	µg/L	19	47
		lbs/day[3]	0.24	0.6
14	Cyanide[5/]	µg/L	4.3	8.5

CTR #	Constituent	Units	Discharge Limitations[4/] Monthly Average[1/]	Daily Maximum[2/]
		lbs/day[3]	0.055	0.106
8	Mercury[5/]	µg/L	0.051	0.12
		lbs/day[3]	0.00064	0.0015
7	Lead[5/]	µg/L	10	30
		lbs/day[3]	0.125	0.38
23	Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	34	77
		lbs/day[3]	0.43	0.97
27	Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	46	100
		lbs/day[3]	0.58	1.25
105	Lindane	µg/L	0.063	0.126
		lbs/day[3]	0.0008	0.0025
109	4,4'-DDE	µg/L	0.00059	0.00118
		lbs/day[3]	0.0000074	0.0000147
108	4,4'-DDT	µg/L	0.00059	0.00118
		lbs/day[3]	0.0000074	0.0000147

1/ As defined in Standard Provisions, Attachment N.

2/ 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.

3/ Based on the plant design flow rate of 1.5 mgd. During events such as storms in which the flow exceeds the design capacity, the mass discharge rate limitations will be tabulated using the concentration limits and the actual flow rates.

4/ RPA triggered limits based on CTR/SIP.

5/ Concentration expressed as total recoverable.

6/ Limit based on Title 22 MCL because it is more stringent than the proposed CTR-based limit.

Interim Effluent Limitations

a. Discharger shall comply immediately with the following interim effluent limits until November 10, 2008. Thereafter, the Discharger shall comply with the limitations specified in Section I.A.2.b.

CTR #	Constituent	Units	Monthly Average [1]
6	Copper	µg/L	33
14	Cyanide	µg/L	8.5
23	Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	73
27	Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	62
105	Lindane	µg/L	0.43

[1] Interim limits prescribed as maximum detected effluent concentration or based on P-limit calculations.

b. The Discharger shall submit quarterly progress reports (January 15, April 15, July 15 and October 15) to describe the progress of studies and/or actions undertaken to reduce these compounds in the effluent, and to achieve compliance with the final effluent limits in this Order by November 10, 2008. The first progress report shall be received at the Region Board by July 15, 2004.

B. OTHER EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

1. The pH of wastes discharged shall at all times be within the range of 6.5 to 8.5.

2. The temperature of wastes discharged shall not exceed 80°F.

3. 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.

4. In accordance with 40 CFR Parts 133.102(a)(3) and 133.102(b)(3), for BOD and total suspended solids, respectively, 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 the same time period.

5. The wastes discharged to water courses shall at all times be adequately disinfected. For the purpose of this requirement, the wastes shall be considered adequately disinfected if the median number of coliform organisms at some point in the treatment process does not exceed 2.2 per 100 milliliters, and the number of coliform organisms does not exceed 23 per 100 milliliters in more than one sample within any 30-day period. The median value shall be determined from the bacteriological results of the last seven (7) days for which analysis has been completed. Samples shall be collected at a time when wastewater flow and characteristics are most demanding on treatment facilities and the disinfection processes.

6. For the protection of the water contact recreation beneficial use, the wastes discharged to watercourses shall have received adequate treatment, so that the turbidity of the wastewater does not exceed a daily average of 2 Nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs), and does not exceed 5 NTUs more than 5 percent of the time (72 minutes) during any 24 hour period.

7. To protect underlying groundwater basins, pollutants shall not be present in the wastes discharged at concentrations that pose a threat to groundwater quality.

C. Receiving Water Limitations

1. For waters designated with a warm freshwater habitat (WARM) beneficial use, the water temperature shall not be altered by more than 5°F above the natural temperature, at receiving water monitoring station, R-2, located downstream of the discharge point. The natural temperature of the receiving water shall be determined at receiving water monitoring station, R-1, located upstream of the discharge point.

2. The pH of inland surface waters shall not be depressed below 6.5 or raised above 8.5 as a result of wastes discharged. Ambient pH levels shall not be changed more than 0.5 units from natural conditions as a result of wastes discharged.

3. The dissolved oxygen in the receiving water shall not be depressed below 5 mg/L as a result of the wastes discharged.

4. The fecal coliform concentration in the receiving water shall not exceed the following limits as a result of the waste discharged:

1. Geometric Mean Limits
   a. E. coli density shall not exceed 126/100 ml.
   b. Fecal coliform density shall not exceed 200/100 ml.

2. Single Sample Limits
   a. E. coli density shall not exceed 235/100 ml.
   b. Fecal coliform density shall not exceed 400/100 ml.

   The geometric mean values should be calculated based on a statistically sufficient number of samples (generally not less than 5 samples equally spaced over a 30-day period).

   If any single sample limits are exceeded, the Regional Board may require repeat sampling on a daily basis until sample falls below the single sample limit in order to determine the persistence of the exceedance.

   When repeat sampling is required because of an exceedance of any one single sample limit, values from all samples collected during that 30-day period will be used to calculate the geometric mean.

5. Waters shall be free of changes in turbidity that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. Increases in natural turbidity attributable to controllable water quality factors shall not exceed the following limits as a result of waste discharged:

   a. Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 50 NTU, increases shall not exceed 20%; and,

   b. Where natural turbidity is greater than 50 NTU, increases shall

not exceed 10%.

6. The wastes discharged shall not produce concentrations of toxic substances in the receiving water that are toxic to or cause detrimental physiological responses in human, animal, or aquatic life.

7. The wastes discharged shall not cause concentrations of contaminants to occur at levels that are harmful to human health in waters which are existing or potential sources of drinking water.

8. The concentrations of toxic pollutants in the water column, sediments, or biota shall not adversely affect beneficial uses as a result of the wastes discharged.

9. The wastes discharged shall not contain substances that result in increases in BOD which adversely affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

10. 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.

11. The wastes discharged shall not cause the receiving waters to contain any substance in concentrations that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

12. The wastes discharged shall not alter the natural taste, odor, and color of fish, shellfish, or other surface water resources used for human consumption.

13. The wastes discharged shall not result in problems due to breeding of mosquitoes, gnats, black flies, midges, or other pests.

14. The wastes discharged shall not result in visible floating particulates, foams, and oil and grease in the receiving waters.

15. The wastes discharged shall not alter the color of the receiving waters; create a visual contrast with the natural appearance of the water; nor cause aesthetically undesirable discoloration of the receiving waters.

16. The wastes discharged shall not contain any individual pesticide or combination of pesticides in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses of the receiving waters. There shall be no increase in pesticide concentrations found in bottom sediments or aquatic life as a result of the wastes discharged.

D. TOXICITY REQUIREMENTS:

1. ACUTE TOXICITY LIMITATION AND REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFLUENT

a. The acute toxicity of the effluent shall be such that: (i) the average survival in the undiluted effluent for any three (3) consecutive 96-hour static or continuous flow bioassay tests shall be at least 90%, and (ii) no single test producing less than 70 % survival.

b. If either of the above requirements I.D.1.a.i. or I.D.1.a.ii. is not met, the Discharger shall conduct six additional tests over a six-week period. The Discharger shall ensure that they receive results of a failing acute toxicity test within 24 hours of the completion of the test and the additional tests shall begin within 3 business days of the receipt of the result. If the additional tests indicate compliance with acute toxicity limitation, the Discharger may resume testing at the regular frequency as specified in the monitoring and reporting program. However, if the results of any two of the six accelerated tests are less than 90% survival, then the Discharger shall begin a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE). The TIE shall include all reasonable steps to identify the sources of toxicity. Once the sources are identified, the Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to reduce toxicity to meet the limits.

c. If the initial test and any of the additional six acute toxicity bioassay tests result in less than 70 % survival, the Discharger shall immediately implement the Initial Investigation Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Workplan described later in this section.

d. The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program CI 6769 (Attachment T).

2. CHRONIC TOXICITY REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFLUENT

a. The chronic toxicity of the effluent shall be expressed and reported in toxic units (TU_c) where:

$$TU_c = \frac{100}{NOEC}$$

The No Observable Effect Concentration (NOEC) is expressed as the maximum percent effluent concentration that causes no observable effect on test organisms, as determined by the results of a critical life stage toxicity test.

b. There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.

c. If the chronic toxicity of the effluent exceeds the monthly median of 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall immediately implement an accelerated chronic toxicity testing program according to Monitoring and Reporting Program CI 6769,

Item VII.D.2.d.. If any three out of the initial test and the six accelerated tests exceed 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall initiate a TIE and implement the Initial Investigation TRE Workplan .

d. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 6769 (Attachment T).

e. This permit may be reopened to include effluent limitations for pollutants found to be causing chronic toxicity and to include numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations based on direction from the State Water Resources Control Board or failure of the District to comply fully with the TRE/TIE requirements.

3. CHRONIC TOXICITY REQUIREMENTS FOR RECEIVING WATER

a. There shall be no chronic toxicity in ambient waters as a result of wastes discharged.

b. Receiving water and effluent toxicity testing shall be performed concurrently on the same day or as close to each other as possible.

c. If the chronic toxicity in the receiving water at the monitoring station immediately downstream of the discharge exceeds 1.0 TU_c in a critical life stage test and the toxicity is a result of the effluent waste discharge, then the Discharger shall immediately implement an accelerated chronic toxicity testing according to Monitoring and Reporting Program CI 6769, section VI.D.2.d. If two of the six tests exceed 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall initiate a TIE and implement the Initial Investigation TRE Workplan.

d. If the chronic toxicity of the receiving water upstream of the discharge is greater than the downstream chronic toxicity and the TU_c of the effluent chronic toxicity test is less than 1 TU_c, then accelerated monitoring need not be implemented.

4. PREPARATION OF AN INITIAL INVESTIGATION TRE WORKPLAN

The Discharger shall submit a detailed copy of the Discharger's Initial Investigation TRE Workplan to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board for approval within 90 days of the effective date of this permit. The Discharger shall use EPA manuals EPA/833B-99/002 (municipal) as guidance, or most current version. At a minimum, the TRE Work Plan must contain the provisions in Attachment C. This Workplan shall describe the steps the Discharger intends to follow if toxicity is detected, and should include, at a minimum:

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

b. A description of the facility's methods of maximizing in-house treatment

efficiency and good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in operation of the facility; and,

c. If a TIE is necessary, an indication of the person who would conduct the TIEs (i.e., an in-house expert or an outside contractor). See MRP Section for guidance manuals.

II. SLUDGE REQUIREMENTS

A. The Discharger shall comply with the requirements of 40 CFR Part 503, in general, and in particular the requirements in Attachment B of this Order, [*Biosolids Use and Disposal Requirements*]. These requirements are enforceable by the USEPA.

B. The Discharger shall comply, if applicable, with the requirements in State issued statewide general Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No. 2000-10-DWQ, titled "General waste Discharge Requirements for the Discharge of Biosolids to Land for use as a soil Amendment in Agricultural, Silvicultural and Horticultural and Land Reclamation Activities" adopted in August 2000.

C. The Discharger shall comply, if applicable, with WDRs issued by other Regional Boards to which jurisdiction the biosoilds are transported and applied.

The Discharger shall furnish this Regional Board with a copy of any report submitted to USEPA, State Board or other regional board with respect to municipal sludge or biosolids.

III. PROVISIONS

A. Discharge of wastes to any point other than specifically described in this Order and permit is prohibited and constitutes a violation thereof.

B. The Discharger shall comply with all applicable effluent limitations, national standards of performance, toxic and pretreatment effluent standards, and all federal regulations established pursuant to Sections 208(b), 301, 302, 303(d), 304, 306, 307, 316, 403 and 405 of the Federal Clean Water Act and amendments thereto.

C. This Order includes the attached Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and "Standard Provisions and General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements" (Attachment N). If there is any conflict between provisions stated hereinbefore and the attached "Standard Provisions", those provisions stated herein prevail.

D. This Order includes the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment T). If there is any conflict between provisions stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program and the "Standard Provisions" (Attachment N), those provisions stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program prevail.

E. This Order includes the attached Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) (Attachment A).

F. Compliance Determination

1. Compliance with single constituent effluent limitation – If the concentration of the pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reported Minimum Level (see Reporting Requirement III. A. of *M&RP)*, then the Discharger is out of compliance.

2. Compliance with monthly average limitations - In determining compliance with monthly average limitations, the following provisions shall apply to all constituents:

   a. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually, does not exceed the monthly average limit for that constituent, the Discharger has demonstrated compliance with the monthly average limit for that month.

   b. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually, exceeds the monthly average limit for any constituent, the Discharger shall collect four additional samples at approximately equal intervals during the month. All five analytical results shall be reported in the monitoring report for that month, or 45 days after results for the additional samples were received, whichever is later.

      When all sample results are greater than or equal to the reported Minimum Level (see Reporting Requirement III. A. of M&RP), the numerical average of the analytical results of these five samples will be used for compliance determination.

      When one or more sample results are reported as "Not-Detected (ND)" or "Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)" (see Reporting Requirement III. D. of *M&RP*), the median value of these four samples shall be used for compliance determination. If one or both of the middle values is ND or DNQ, the median shall be the lower of the two middle values.

   c. In the event of noncompliance with a monthly average effluent limitation, the sampling frequency for that constituent shall be increased to weekly and shall continue at this level until compliance with the monthly average effluent limitation has been demonstrated.

   d. If only one sample was obtained for the month or more than a monthly period and the result exceed the monthly average, then the Discharger is in violation of the monthly average limit.

3. Compliance with effluent limitations expressed as a sum of several constituents – If the sum of the individual pollutant concentrations is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the Reported Minimum Level, then the Discharger is out of compliance. In calculating the sum of the concentrations of a group of pollutants, consider constituents reported as ND or DNQ to have concentrations equal to zero, provided that the applicable ML is used.

4. Compliance with effluent limitations expressed as a median – in determining compliance with a median limitation, the analytical results in a set of data will be arranged in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order); and

   a. If the number of measurements (n) is odd, then the median will be calculated as = $X_{(n+1)/2}$, or

   b. If the number of measurements (n) is even, then the median will be calculated as = $[X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1}]$, i.e. the midpoint between the n/2 and n/2+1 data points.

   Consecutive exceedances of the coliform Weekly median effluent limitation, which take place within a calendar week and result from a single operational upset, shall be treated as a single violation.

5. Compliance with the receiving water temperature limitation – If the receiving water temperature downstream of the discharge, exceeds 80 ^{0}F as a result of:

   a. high temperature in the ambient air, or

   b. high temperature in the receiving water upstream of the discharge,

   then the exceedance shall not be considered a violation.

G. In calculating mass emission rates from the monthly average concentrations, use one half of the method detection limit for "Not Detected" (ND) and the estimated concentration for "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) for the calculation of the monthly average concentration. To be consistent with section II.E.3., if all pollutants belonging to the same group are reported as ND or DNQ, the sum of the individual pollutant concentrations should be considered as zero for the calculation of the monthly average concentration.

H. Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

1. The goal of the PMP is to reduce all potential sources of a pollutant through pollutant minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures, in order to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the effluent limitation.

   Pollution prevention measures may be particularly appropriate for persistent bioaccumulative priority pollutants where there is evidence that beneficial uses are being impacted. The completion of a Pollution Prevention Plan, required in accordance with California Water Code Section 13263.3 (d) shall fulfill the PMP requirements in this section.

2. The Discharger shall develop a PMP if all of the following conditions are true, and shall submit the PMP to the Regional Board within 90 days of determining

the conditions are true:

a. The calculated effluent limitation is less than the reported minimum level;

b. The concentration of the priority pollutant is reported as “Detected, but Not Quantified”, DNQ;

c. There is evidence showing that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above the calculated effluent limitation.

3. The Discharger shall also develop a PMP if all of the following conditions are true, and shall submit the PMP to the Regional Board within 90 days of determining the conditions are true:

a. The calculated effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit;

b. The concentration of the pollutant is reported as “Not-Detected”, ND;

c. There is evidence showing that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above the calculated effluent limitation.

4. The Discharger shall consider the following in determining whether the priority pollutant is present in the effluent at levels above the calculated effluent limitation:

a. health advisories for fish consumption;

b. presence of whole effluent toxicity;

c. results of benthic or aquatic organism tissue sampling;

d. sample results from analytical methods more sensitive than methods included in the permit;

e. the concentration of the pollutant is reported as DNQ and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit.

5. Elements of a PMP. The PMP shall include actions and submittals acceptable to the Regional Board including, but not limited to, the following:

a. An annual review and semi-annual monitoring of potential sources of the reportable pollutant, which may include fish tissue monitoring and other bio-uptake sampling;

b. Quarterly monitoring for the reportable priority pollutant in the influent to the wastewater treatment system;

c. Submittal of a control strategy designed to proceed toward the goal of maintaining concentrations of the reportable priority pollutant in the

effluent at or below the calculated effluent limitation;

d. Implementation of appropriate cost-effective control measures for the priority pollutant, consistent with the control strategy; and,

e. An annual status report that shall be sent to the Regional Board including:

- All PMP monitoring results for the previous year;
- A list of potential sources of the reportable pollutant;
- A summary of all action taken in accordance with control strategy; and,
- A description of actions to be taken in the following year.

I. The Discharger shall provide standby or emergency power facilities and/or storage capacity or other means so that in the event of plant upset or outage due to power failure or other cause, discharge of raw or inadequately treated sewage does not occur.

J. The Discharger shall protect the facility from inundation which could occur as a result of a flood having a predicted frequency of once in 100 years.

IV. REOPENERS and MODIFICATIONS

A. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with SIP section 2.2.2.A to incorporate the results of revised reasonable potential analyses to be conducted upon receipt of any additional data provided.

B. This Order may be modified, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR Parts 122 and 124 to include requirements for the implementation of the watershed protection management approach.

C. The Board may modify, or revoke and reissue this Order if present or future investigations demonstrate that the discharge(s) governed by this Order will cause, have the potential to cause, or will contribute to adverse impacts on water quality and/or beneficial uses of the receiving waters.

D. This Order may also be modified, revoked, and reissued or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR Parts 122.44, 122.62 to 122.64, 125.62, and 125.64. Causes for taking such actions include, but are not limited to, failure to comply with any condition of this Order, endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity, or acquisition of newly obtained information which would have justified the application of different conditions if known at the time of Order adoption. The filing of a request by the District for an Order modification, revocation and issuance or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any condition of this Order.

E. This Order may be modified, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR Parts 122 to 124, to include new MLs.

F. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise effluent limitations as a result of future Basin Plan Amendments, such as an update of the ammonia or chloride objective, or the adoption of a TMDL for the Calleguas Creek Watershed.

G. This Order may be reopened and modified to revise the chronic toxicity effluent limitation, to the extent necessary, to be consistent with State Board precedential decisions, new policies, new laws, or new regulations.

H. This Order may be reopened to modify final effluent limits, if at the conclusion of necessary studies conducted by the Discharger, the Regional Board determines that dilution credits, attenuation factors, or metal translators are warranted.

V. EXPIRATION DATE

This Order expires on November 10, 2008.

The Discharger must file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with Title 23, California Code of Regulations, not later than 180 days in advance of such date as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements.

VI. RESCISSION

Order No. 2000-09, adopted by this Regional Board on January 26, 2000, is hereby rescinded, except for enforcement purposes.

I, Dennis A. Dickerson, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, on December 4, 2003.

Dennis A. Dickerson
Executive Officer

/NJ

FIGURE 1

FIGURE 2