

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

RESOLUTION NO. R5-2004-0143

AMENDING WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
ORDER NO. R5-2003-0084
NPDES NO. CA0078794

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1
WALNUT GROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SACRAMENTO COUNTY

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

1. On 6 June 2003, the Regional Board adopted Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R5-2003-0084, NPDES No. CA0078794, prescribing waste discharge requirements for the Sacramento County Sanitation District No. 1 (CSD-1) Walnut Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (hereafter Discharger) in Sacramento County.
2. The Discharger discharges disinfected secondary effluent into an unnamed agricultural drainage ditch (Ditch) during the winter months (1 November through 15 May), and secondary undischarged effluent to evaporation/percolation ponds during the remainder of the year. The treated effluent in the Ditch is pumped through a levee into Snodgrass Slough, which is tributary to the Sacramento River. All these waterbodies, including the Ditch are found within the legal boundaries of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. The Discharge into Snodgrass Slough occurs at latitude N38° 14' 12" and longitude W121° 29' 57".
3. Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 96-069, the previous permit for this facility, contained findings including the following, "The beneficial uses of the unnamed agricultural drain are agricultural supply, and preservation and enhancement of non-aquatic resources." In drafting Order No. R5-2003-0084, the Regional Board reevaluated the limited beneficial uses of the Ditch and determined the previous permit did not fully protect all beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan, and additional uses were added in the new Order.
4. The application of new beneficial uses to the Ditch resulted in additional effluent and receiving water limitations for waste constituents having reasonable potential to cause an exceedance of a water quality standard. Because, the reevaluation and addition of beneficial uses was considered a new interpretation of the Basin Plan, the new order included time schedules for the Discharger to achieve compliance with the new limitations.
5. Due to the complexities of issues and associated costs involved in complying with the new effluent, receiving water and ground water limitations contained in Order No. R5-2003-0084, the Discharger was allowed additional time to consider alternative means of complying with the new Order other than treatment plant upgrades of tertiary or even post-tertiary processes

and continued discharge at their existing location. The other alternatives included but were not limited to 1) discharge of existing secondary treated effluent directly to the Sacramento River (one half mile west of the current discharge point, and 2) connecting the wastewater collection system to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) (10 mile north of the City of Walnut Grove). Because these alternatives could provide better economic assurances of long-term treatment and disposal for the people of Walnut Grove, the new Order provided up to one year to conduct feasibility studies to evaluate and select the most cost effective and environmental feasible alternative.

6. The Discharger completed an *Engineering Feasibility Report for Courtland and Walnut Grove Wastewater Treatment Facility (WTF)*, (Feasibility Report) and submitted a copy to the Regional Board on 17 February 2004. Based on the findings of this report, the Discharger concluded that the least expensive alternative to comply with the new requirements, is to construct a pipeline from the two facilities (Walnut Grove and Courtland WTF) and convey untreated wastewater back to the SRWTP in Elk Grove. The Discharger has also submitted a timeline and schedule showing implementation and completion of this alternative by 1 June 2008.

The connection to the SRWTP will consist of pump stations at the existing treatment plants and three segments of force main. The first segment is approximately four miles of 8-inch force main from Courtland, and the second segment is approximately six miles of 10-inch force main from Walnut Grove. These force mains would combine near the intersection of Snodgrass Slough and Lambert Road into a third segment consisting of a single 12-inch force main that would connect to CSD-1's collection system at the pump station located at the Rio Cosumnes Correctional Center (RCCC). The length of this final leg is estimated to be five miles for a total pipe length of 15 miles.

The Discharger has indicated that the estimated net present value (35-year life cycle cost) of this alternative is \$21 million, with a capital cost (total project cost) of \$14.5 million and an equivalent annual operation and maintenance (O&M) cost of approximately \$0.37 million, including the cost of treatment at the SRWTP.

7. The Discharger by the adoption of a Resolution by the CSD-1's Board of Directors on **22 September 2004**, has committed funds to initiate the design of the project that would ultimately pump wastewater from Walnut Grove and Courtland to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant in Elk Grove. The proposed project must be evaluated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, 21000, et seq) and fulfill all requirements therein. In an effort to conserve capital improvements to a facility planned for abandonment in four years, the Discharger has requested reevaluation of the current permit and has identified the following issues to be considered for modification pending discharge elimination:

AMENDMENT OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. R5-2004-0143
SACRAMENTO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1
WALNUT GROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SACRAMENTO COUNTY

- 3 -

- a) To delete the new requirement that after 1 November 2004 the effluent limitation for chlorine residual shall apply as an end of pipe limitation into the ditch.
 - b) To recalculate the interim limitation for cyanide based on additional more representative data.
 - c) To remove the requirement to comply with the new receiving water limitation for dissolved oxygen and temperature at the ditch.
 - d) To change the new pH effluent limitation for disposal to ponds to have a range of 6.5 to 10.
 - e) To remove the new monitoring requirement for the City of Locke's effluent as required in Provision G.3 and in the Monitoring and Reporting Program.
 - f) To waive the groundwater evaluation study as required in Provision G.9.
 - g) To remove the requirement to conduct a Salinity Source Control Study as required in Provision G.10.
 - h) To remove the requirement to conduct a corrective action plan and submittal of pollution prevention plans and a compliance schedule justification for arsenic, bis (2-ethyhexyl) phthalate, chloroform, bromodichloromethane, chlorodibromomethane and cyanide as required in Provision G.11.
 - i) To remove the requirement to conduct a TRE/TIE as required in Provision G.13, since this process would ultimately end in source control or process modification and would not be practical in light of future abandonment of the treatment facility.
 - j) To remove influent and effluent monitoring requirements for arsenic and effluent monitoring requirements for chloroform, manganese and total dissolved solids (TDS) since these constituents do not have interim limitations and collection of these data has no significance upon abandonment of the treatment facility.
 - k) To remove the one-time monitoring requirement for priority pollutants in the effluent in the winter/spring of 2007.
 - l) To remove the effluent monitoring requirement for ammonia since there is no interim effluent limitation and significant plant improvements are necessary to provide nitrification.
 - m) To remove receiving water monitoring requirements for flow, dissolved oxygen, pH and EC, and remove receiving water monitoring stations R1, R2 at the Ditch and R3 and R4 at Snodgrass Slough.
8. The Regional Board supports the Discharger's efforts to connect the Walnut Grove and Courtland wastewater treatment and disposal facilities to the SRWTP. Interim requirements in Order No. R5-2003-0084 are being reconsidered at the Discharger's request to avoid unnecessary costs and provide incentive to pursuing regionalization. Therefore, this resolution amending Order No. R5-2003-0084 provides conditional delays in treatment improvements and monitoring requirements pending construction of a wastewater conveyance pipeline, connecting to SRWTP in accordance with a compliance time schedule and abandonment of the existing treatment facility by 1 June 2008. The following amendments to Order No. R5-2003-0084 will address the issues presented by the Discharger:

AMENDMENT OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. R5-2004-0143
SACRAMENTO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1
WALNUT GROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SACRAMENTO COUNTY

- 4 -

- a) The effective date of the effluent chlorine residual limitation B.2 is changed from 1 November 2004 to 1 June 2008 to coincide with the abandonment of the facility and discontinuance of discharge into the ditch.
 - b) The interim effluent limitation B.2 for cyanide is recalculated to be 528 µg/l, using additional more representative data.
 - c) The compliance date for the new receiving water limitations E.1 and E.8 for dissolved oxygen and temperature respectively, have been extended to 1 June 2008.
 - d) The pH effluent limitation upper bound of 9.0 for disposal to ponds C.5 has been changed to be effective 1 June 2008 and in the interim the upper bound of 10 is effective.
 - e) Provision G.3 requiring monitoring of City of Locke contribution to the Walnut Grove collection system has been removed along with the influent monitoring requirements for influent from City of Locke in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2003-0084.
 - f) Provisions G.9, G.10, and G.11 have been modified to waive interim requirements provided the Discharger is in compliance with the time schedule contained in a new provision for connection to SRWTP and abandonment of the existing treatment facility. The full compliance dates for tasks contained in these provisions are maintained in the Order to require full compliance with effluent limitations by 1 June 2008.
 - g) Provision G.13 has not been modified, however the chronic toxicity monitoring requirements contained in the MRP No. R5-2003-0084 have been delayed pending compliance with the new time schedule for connection to the SRWTP.
 - h) MRP No. R5-2003-0084 has been modified to delay influent and effluent monitoring for arsenic and effluent monitoring for ammonia, chloroform, manganese, TDS and the one-time priority pollutants monitoring, provided the Discharger maintains compliance with the new time schedule for connection to the SRWTP.
 - i) The receiving water monitoring stations R3 and R4 at Snodgrass Slough and flow monitoring of stations R1 and R2 at the Ditch have been removed. Short-term collection of these receiving water data is not necessary since the discharge will be discontinued within four years.
9. The action to adopt or amend an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.), requiring preparation of an environmental impact report or negative declaration in accordance with Section 13389 of the California Water Code.
 10. The Regional Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to amend waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity for a public hearing and an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.
 11. The Regional Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge.

AMENDMENT OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
 RESOLUTION NO. R5-2004-0143
 SACRAMENTO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1
 WALNUT GROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
 SACRAMENTO COUNTY

12. This Order shall amend Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R5-2003-0084, NPDES No. CA0078794, pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA, and amendments thereto, and shall take effect upon the date of hearing, provided EPA has no objections.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order No. R5-2003-0084 is amended solely to modify effluent limitation B.2 for chlorine residual and cyanide, the pH effluent limitation C.5 for disposal to ponds; extend the compliance date for the receiving water limitations E.1 and E.8 for dissolved oxygen and temperature respectively; delay chronic toxicity monitoring, delay influent monitoring for arsenic, effluent monitoring for ammonia, arsenic, chloroform, manganese and TDS, and effluent monitoring of priority pollutants; remove receiving water monitoring for flow in the Ditch and R3 and R4 sampling stations in Snodgrass Slough; remove influent sampling from the City of Locke; replace Provision G.3 with a new Provision G.3 that includes a time schedule for completion of the connection to SRWTP; and modify Provisions G.9, G.10, and G.11. Sacramento County Sanitation District No. 1, its agents, successors and assigns, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with Amended Order No. R5-2003-0084:

1. Effluent Limitation B.2 for chlorine residual and cyanide in Order No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended to read as follows (all other constituents, limitations and footnotes to remain the same):

B. Effluent Limitations for Discharge to Ditch:

2. The Discharge of effluent in excess of the following interim limits is prohibited (in effect through 31 May 2008):

<u>Constituents</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Monthly Average</u>	<u>Weekly Average</u>	<u>Daily Maximum</u>
Chlorine Residual ⁵	mg/l		0.01 ³	0.02 ⁴
Cyanide	µg/l			528

³ 4-day average

⁴ 1-hr average

⁵ Effective at the discharge pump prior to discharge to Snodgrass Slough.

2. Effluent Limitation for Disposal to Ponds C.5 for pH in Order No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended to read as follows:

C. Effluent Limitations for Disposal to Ponds:

5. Percolation/Evaporation ponds shall not have a pH less than 6.5 or greater than 10 averaged over 24-hr period, and effective 1 June 2008, percolation/evaporation ponds shall not have a pH less than 6.5 or greater than 9.0 averaged over 24-hr period.
3. Receiving Water Limitations E.1 for dissolved oxygen and E.8 for temperature in Order No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended to read as follows:

E. Receiving Water Limitations:

The discharge shall not cause the following in the receiving water:

1. Beginning 1 June 2008, concentrations of dissolved oxygen to fall below 5 mg/l.
 8. Beginning 1 June 2008, the ambient temperature to increase more than 5 °F.
4. Provision G.3 in Order No. R5-2003-0084 shall be deleted, and a new Provision G.3 added as follows:

G. Provisions:

- ~~3. Following the completion of City of Locke's sewer system installation, as described in Finding No. 8, a separate sampling of Locke's contribution into WGWTP is required to demonstrate compliance with the CTR. A single sample of the combined Locke and Walnut Grove effluent shall be sampled for constituents in Attachment C through C4 excluding Dioxins. The sample shall be collected in the first two weeks of discharge in November or December 2004. Results of the effluent sampling shall be submitted with the first quarterly monitoring report on **1 May 2005**. If based on this data or other information available at a later date, Locke's discharge is found to result in the WGWTP effluent having additional reasonable potential to cause an adverse impact on beneficial uses of the receiving water, this permit may be reopened.~~
3. The Discharger as a means of compliance with the new requirements in Order No. R5-2003-0084 has proposed the construction of a pipeline to connect to the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant, and abandonment of the existing Walnut Grove wastewater Treatment Plant by **1 June 2008**. The Discharger shall achieve full compliance with final effluent and receiving water limitations contained in this Order in accordance with the following time schedule:

AMENDMENT OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
 RESOLUTION NO. R5-2004-0143
 SACRAMENTO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1
 WALNUT GROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
 SACRAMENTO COUNTY

<u>Task</u>	<u>Date Due</u>
Submit Design and detailed construction schedule ¹	1 April 2005
Progress Report ² No. 1	1 December 2005
Progress Report ² No. 2	1 December 2006
Begin Construction of connection to SRWTP	1 April 2007
Progress Report ³ No. 3	1 December 2007
Complete Construction of connection to SRWTP	1 April 2008
Full compliance with permit	1 June 2008

-
1. The detailed schedule should include all applicable permitting (Fish and Game, Army Corps, County, etc.) and CEQA Processing (preparation, circulation and final certification).
 2. These Progress reports shall detail what measures have been implemented, status on the construction and permitting progress, and whether additional measures are necessary to meet the time schedule progress.
 3. This Progress report shall indicate whether or not connection to the SRWTP is on schedule and will meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008, and if not what additional measures are necessary to meet the full compliance date.

5. Provisions G.9, G.10, and G.11 shall be amended to read as follows:

G. Provisions:

9. **Hydrogeologic Evaluation and Groundwater Monitoring Tasks.** Since the Discharger, in accordance with Provision G1 of this Order has committed to the abandonment of the existing facility by connecting to the SRWTP with a compliance date of **1 June 2008**, this Provision (and this Order's associated Monitoring and Reporting Program) requiring groundwater monitoring is waived.

However, if the Discharger after submitting Progress Report No. 3 as required in amended Provision G3, is not on schedule to meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008, then it shall commence a hydrogeologic investigation within the area affected and potentially affected by the WGWT and its discharge(s) to evaporation ponds and submit an evaluation workplan and time schedule by **1 June 2008** which shall include groundwater monitoring and monitoring well network installation, and submittal of a groundwater technical report.

The groundwater monitoring network shall include one or more background monitoring wells and sufficient number of designated monitoring wells to evaluate performance of BPTC measures and determine groundwater gradient if the discharge has degraded groundwater. These include monitoring wells immediately down gradient of every treatment, storage, and disposal unit that does or may release waste constituents to groundwater. All wells shall comply with appropriate

AMENDMENT OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. R5-2004-0143
SACRAMENTO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1
WALNUT GROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SACRAMENTO COUNTY

- 8 -

standards as described in *California Well Standards Bulletin 74-90* (June 1991) and *Water Well Standards: State of California Bulletin 94-81* (December 1981), and any more stringent standards adopted by the Discharger or county pursuant to CWC section 13801. The existing well network will be evaluated, and the proposed network should include existing monitoring wells where they will serve to measure compliance or provide other relevant information (e.g., depth to groundwater).

The groundwater monitoring shall be in accordance with this Order's Monitoring and Reporting Program. After the first sampling event, the Discharger shall report on its sampling protocol as specified in this Order's Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP). The groundwater quality must be monitored at least quarterly for a minimum of four quarters for U.S. EPA priority pollutants, nutrients, coliform organisms, pH, TDS and EC.

The groundwater technical report shall describe the underlying geology, existing wells (active and otherwise), local well construction practices and standards, well restrictions, hydrogeology and assess all impacts of the wastewater discharge on water quality. The technical report must present, for each monitoring event, determinations for the direction and gradient of groundwater flow.

If the monitoring shows that any constituent concentrations are increased above background water quality, the Discharger shall submit a technical report describing the evaluation's results and critiquing each evaluated component with respect to BPTC and minimizing the discharge's impact on groundwater quality. In no case shall the discharge be allowed to exceed a water quality objective. Where treatment system deficiencies are documented, the technical report shall provide recommendations for necessary modifications (e.g., new or revised salinity source control measures, WGWTP component upgrade and retrofit) to achieve BPTC and identify the source of funding and proposed schedule for modifications for achieving full compliance prior to expiration of this Order. This Order may be reopened and additional groundwater limitations added.

10. The Discharger, in accordance with Provision G1 of this Order has committed to the abandonment of the existing facility by connecting to the SRWTP with a compliance date of **1 June 2008**, and since this selected alternative would provide an alternative means of compliance with all applicable Basin Plan and the CTR criteria, a corrective action plan required by this Provision will no longer be required.

However, if the Discharger after submitting Progress Report No. 3 as required in amended Provision G3, is not on schedule to meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008, or chooses a different alternative that is determined to cause or have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion for salinity,

then the Discharger shall develop a **Salinity Source Control Study** including **magnesium and chloride**, which evaluates sources of salts in the Wastewater Treatment Plant effluent, and which addresses salt reduction and/or source control alternatives. The Discharger shall select and implement salt reduction and/or source control alternatives in accordance with a schedule developed as part of the study. Therefore on 1 January 2007, if deemed necessary, the Discharger shall submit a workplan and time schedule to begin the Salinity Source Control Study, but still be required to be in compliance with the effluent limits for salinity (TDS and chloride) by **1 June 2008**.

11. **Arsenic, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate, Chloroform, Bromodichloromethane, Dibromochloromethane, and Cyanide** have been detected in the effluent at concentrations that exceed water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and the CTR criteria. Sampling indicates the existing wastewater treatment plant will not be capable of consistently meeting the effluent limitations for these constituents. Hence, a corrective action plan is necessary to address the reduction and/or source control alternatives. Since the Discharger, in accordance with Provision G1 of this Order has committed to the abandonment of the existing facility by connecting to the SRWTP with a compliance date of **1 June 2008**, and since this selected alternative would provide an alternative means of compliance with all applicable Basin Plan and the CTR criteria, a corrective action plan required by this Provision will no longer be required.

However, if the Discharger after submitting Progress Report No. 3 as required in amended Provision G3, is not on schedule to meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008, or a different alternative is selected and the WGWTP is anticipated to continue to operate after 1 June 2008, then the Discharger shall develop and submit a corrective action plan which evaluates measures to achieve full compliance with these final limitations. Therefore, on 1 January 2007, if deemed necessary, the Discharger shall submit a corrective action plan, implementation schedule and pollution prevention plans and still be required to be in compliance with these limitations by **1 June 2008**.

Upon submittal of the corrective action plan and implementation schedule, the Discharger shall complete and submit a compliance schedule justification for Arsenic, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate, Chloroform, Bromodichloromethane, Dibromochloromethane, and Cyanide. The compliance schedule justification shall include all items specified by the SIP Section 2.1, Paragraph 3 (items (a) through (d)). Implementation of the new water quality based effluent limitations for Arsenic, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate, Chloroform, Bromodichloromethane, Chlorodibromomethane, and Cyanide **become effective 30 days** after submittal of the corrective action plan and implementation schedule if a compliance schedule

justification meeting the requirements of Section 2.1 of the SIP is not completed and submitted by the Discharger. Otherwise, the new final water quality based effluent limitations for Arsenic, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate, Chloroform, Bromodichloromethane, Chlorodibromomethane, and Cyanide required by this Order shall become effective on **1 June 2008**. Furthermore, and in addition to a corrective action plan, the Discharger shall prepare and submit to the Regional Board pollution prevention plans (PPP's) in compliance with the CWC 13263.3(d)(3) for Arsenic, Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate, Chloroform, Bromodichloromethane, Chlorodibromomethane, and Cyanide. Once submitted, the Regional Board will consider whether to require implementation of each PPP after making it available for public comment at a public proceeding with regard to that PPP. (CWC 13263.3(e).)

6. Influent Monitoring in the Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended to remove City of Locke's influent grab sampling requirement and change arsenic monitoring requirement and shall read as follows (all other constituents, sample type and sampling frequency to remain the same):

INFLUENT MONITORING¹

Samples shall be collected at approximately the same time as effluent samples and should be representative of the influent. Influent monitoring shall include at least the following:

<u>Constituents</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Type of Sample</u>	<u>Sampling Frequency</u>
Arsenic	µg/l	Grab	Monthly ⁴

~~1 — City of Locke's influent grab sampling shall be collected at the same time as WGWTP for two consecutive months for the first 12 months and reported separately.~~

⁴ Sampling to be done only when discharging to the drainage Ditch and only after 1 January 2008 if according to Progress Report No. 3 in Provision G3, the Discharger will not be in full compliance by 1 June 2008.

7. Effluent monitoring in the Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended by adding footnote No. 11 for the following constituents and shall read as follows (all other constituents, sample type and sampling frequency to remain the same):

**EFFLUENT MONITORING
 (For Discharge to Drainage Ditch)**

Effluent samples representing discharge location R0 may be collected anywhere between the first receiving water (Ditch) and final disinfection provided the effluent samples are representative of the effluent discharged to the Ditch. Date and time of collection of samples shall be recorded and reported and should be representative of the influent. Effluent monitoring shall include at least the following:

<u>Constituents</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Type of Sample</u>	<u>Sampling Frequency</u>
Ammonia ^{1,2,11}	mg/l, lbs/day	Grab	Weekly
Arsenic ¹¹	µg/l, lbs/day	Grab	Monthly
Total Dissolved Solids ¹¹	mg/l, lbs/day	Grab	Monthly
Manganese ¹¹	µg/l, lbs/day	Grab	Monthly
Chloroform ^{3,11}	µg/l, lbs/day	Grab	Monthly
Priority Pollutants ^{6,11}	µg/l, lbs/day	As appropriate ⁷	Once ⁸

^{11.} Sampling to be conducted only after 1 January 2008 if according to Progress Report No. 3 in Provision G3, the Discharger is not on schedule to meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008.

8. The first paragraph of the Chronic Toxicity Monitoring in the Monitoring and Reporting Program No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended as shown by ~~strikeout~~ and underlined and shall read as follows:

CHRONIC TOXICITY MONITORING

Chronic toxicity monitoring shall be conducted to determine whether the effluent from the treatment ponds is contributing toxicity to the Ditch, and the assimilative capacity characteristics of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Delta. The testing shall be conducted as specified in EPA 821-R-02-013, Fourth Edition, or later amendment. The proposed monitoring will be conducted only after 1 January 2008 if according to Progress Report No. 3 in Provision G3, the Discharger will not be able to meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008, and will ~~twice~~ ~~once during the term of this Order, once from a sample collected during the period of December 2004 and February 2005 and a second~~ consist of one sample taken between December 2007 and February 2008. The monitoring program will be conducted as follows:

9. The receiving water monitoring in the MRP No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended to delete R3 and R4 and remove the monitoring requirement for flow as shown by ~~strikeout~~ and shall read as follows:

RECEIVING WATER MONITORING

<u>Station</u>	<u>Description</u>
R1	100 feet upstream of the Agricultural Drainage Ditch (Upstream of discharge point) or as close as possible with Executive Officer approval
R2	100 feet downstream of the Agricultural Drainage Ditch (Downstream of discharge point) or as close as possible with Executive Officer approval
R3	100 feet north of discharge point (In Snodgrass Slough)
R4	100 feet south of discharge point (In Snodgrass Slough)

<u>Constituents</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Sampling Stations</u>	<u>Sampling Frequency</u>
Flow [†]	mgd	R1, R2, R3, R4	Weekly
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/l	R1, R2, R3, R4	Weekly
pH	number	R1, R2, R3, R4	Weekly
Electrical conductivity @ 25 °C	µmhos/cm	R1, R2, R3, R4	Weekly
Temperature	°F	R1, R2, R3, R4	Weekly

[†] ~~Ditch flows sampling shall be measured during periods when flows are less than 1 cfs and estimated when Ditch flows are greater than 1 cfs. Snodgrass Slough flows shall be estimated based on Sacramento River flows from gauging station or other means when flow controlling locks are open from the Sacramento River. Snodgrass Slough flows may be reported as locks closed when flow is anticipated to be minimal.~~

10. The groundwater monitoring requirement in the MRP No. R5-2003-0084 shall be amended to add a footnote that will only require this monitoring if after 1 January 2008, according to Progress Report No. 3 in Provision G3, the Discharger is not on schedule to meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008, and the new footnote will read as follows:

GROUND WATER MONITORING PROGRAM ^{1,3}

<u>Constituent</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Type of Sample</u>	<u>Sampling Frequency</u>
--------------------	--------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

³ This groundwater monitoring program to be conducted only after 1 January 2008 if in accordance with Progress Report No. 3 of Provision G3, the Discharger is not on schedule to meet the compliance date of 1 June 2008.

AMENDMENT OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. R5-2004-0143
SACRAMENTO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 1
WALNUT GROVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SACRAMENTO COUNTY

- 13 -

11. The information sheet of Order No. R5-2003-0084 with regards to cyanide shall be amended to incorporate additional data and show how the new interim effluent limitation is recalculated with changes shown by ~~strikeout~~ and underlined and shall read as follows:

o. **Cyanide**

Additional data submitted by the Discharger from samples taken in 2004 (making a total of 18 samples), show that cyanide in the effluent ranges between <5 and 110 µg/l. Therefore a new interim limitation has been recalculated applying the USEPA's Technical Support Document approach.

Interim Effluent Limit:

Based on plant performance, the interim effluent limit is calculated statistically by multiplying the maximum observed concentration of ~~22-110~~ µg/l by a factor of ~~4.8~~ 3.14 (obtained from USEPA's Technical Support Document Table 3.1 ~~6C-6~~ for 99th percentile occurrence probability, and using a calculated ~~default~~ coefficient of variation of 1.3 with a total number of 18 samples ~~0.6 due to minimal sampling data with the required sampling frequency at 4 per year~~), the MDEL for Cyanide = 110 µg/l x 4.8 = 528 µg/l as a daily maximum.

I, THOMAS R. PINKOS, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a Resolution adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on 15 October 2004.

THOMAS R. PINKOS, Executive Officer