CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

ORDER R5-2015-0044

AMENDING WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
ORDER R5-2009-0095 (NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0081558)

CITY OF MANTECA and DUTRA FARMS, INC.
CITY OF MANTECA WASTEWATER QUALITY CONTROL FACILITY
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

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

1. On 8 October 2009, the Central Valley Water Board adopted Waste Discharge Requirements Order R5-2009-0095, prescribing waste discharge requirements for the City of Manteca Wastewater Quality Control Facility, San Joaquin County. For purposes of this Order, the City of Manteca is hereafter referred to as "Discharger" and the Wastewater Quality Control Facility is hereafter referred to as "Facility."

2. Waste Discharge Requirements Order R5-2009-0095 (NPDES Permit No. CA0081558) authorizes the discharge of up to 9.87 million gallons per day of disinfected tertiary treated wastewater to the San Joaquin River, within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and authorizes the reuse of undisinfected secondary treated wastewater on agricultural fields surrounding the Facility and on property leased from Dutra Farms Inc. to grow crops for dairy feed.

3. The Discharger owns and operates a Publicly-Owned Treatment Works. The Discharger provides sewerage service for the City of Manteca and a portion of the City of Lathrop, serving a population of approximately 87,000. The Facility has a design average dry weather flow capacity of 9.87 million gallons per day and is an activated sludge tertiary treatment plant. The Facility includes an influent pump station with two mechanical screens that serves two parallel treatment systems. Primary treatment consists of aerated grit removal and primary sedimentation. Primary effluent undergoes biological treatment by ultra fine-bubble activated sludge aeration basins that provides nitrification and denitrification, and is followed by secondary sedimentation. When discharging to the San Joaquin River, the secondary effluent undergoes tertiary treatment through rapid mixing, flocculation, cloth media filtration, and ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection.

4. Order R5-2009-0095 established electrical conductivity effluent limitations based on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary* (Bay-Delta Plan), which includes seasonal South Delta Salinity Objectives for electrical conductivity for the San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge of 700 µmhos/cm (April through August) and 1,000 µmhos/cm (September through March), as the 14-day running average.

5. Order R5-2009-0095 also regulates discharges to groundwater and includes findings regarding the applicability of the sewage treatment plant exception for post-treatment storage facilities provided in California Code of Regulations Title 27 § 20090, subdivision (a). In Order R5-2009-0095 the Central Valley Water Board made a finding that the

Secondary Effluent Storage Pond (SESP), which is used to store treated wastewater prior to irrigation, did not meet the Title 27 exception. This finding was based on State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) precedential Order WQ 2009-0005 for the City of Lodi White Slough Water Pollution Control Facility.

6. On 1 June 2011, the Superior Court for Sacramento County entered a judgment and peremptory writ of mandate in the matter of *City of Tracy v. State Water Resources Control Board* (Case No. 34-2009-8000-0392-CU-WM-GDS) (Tracy Decision), ruling that the South Delta salinity objectives shall not apply to the City of Tracy and other municipal dischargers in the South Delta area pending reconsideration of the South Delta salinity objectives under California Water Code §13241 and adoption of a proper program of implementation under California Water Code §13242 that includes municipal dischargers.

7. On 7 February 2012, the State Water Board issued precedential Order WQ 2012-0001 to reconsider and revise the exemption of land disposal activities of section 20090 of the Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations for the City of Lodi. The revised Water Quality Order clarified that post treatment storage facilities are associated with municipal wastewater treatment and thus meet the sewage treatment plant exception within Title 27.

8. On 4 October 2014, the Superior Court for Sacramento County entered a judgment and peremptory writ of mandate in the matter of *City of Manteca v. State Water Resources Control Board and California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the Central Valley Region* (Case No. 34-2011-80000831) (Manteca Decision), ruling that the City of Manteca is a municipal discharger within the meaning of the Tracy Decision and the SESP contained in the Facility is a post-treatment storage facility within the meaning of the City of Lodi Order (discussed above). The Manteca Decision, therefore, ordered the Central Valley Water Board to modify Order R5-2009-0095 (NPDES Permit No. CA0081558) to 1) remove the electrical conductivity effluent limitations and rationale in the Fact Sheet based on the South Delta salinity objectives, and 2) modify the findings regarding the applicability of the Title 27 sewage treatment plant exception for the SESP. Order R5-2009-0095 is amended in accordance with the Manteca Decision.

9. Issuance of this Order is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”) pursuant to Water Code section 13389, since the adoption or modification of a NPDES permit for an existing source is statutorily exempt and this Order only serves to modify a NPDES permit (*Pacific Water Conditioning Ass’n, Inc. v. City Council of City of Riverside* (1977) 73 Cal.App.3d 546, 555-556.).

10. The Central Valley Water 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 to submit their written views and recommendations.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

Waste Discharge Requirements Order R5-2009-0095 (NPDES No. CA0081558) is amended in accordance with the Manteca Decision, described in Finding 8, to 1) remove the electrical conductivity effluent limitations and rationale in the Fact Sheet based on the South Delta salinity objectives, and 2) modify the findings regarding the applicability of the Title 27 sewage treatment plant exception for the SESP. **Effective immediately upon adoption**, Order R5-2009-0095 is amended as shown in Items 1-12 below.

1. **FINDINGS.** Remove the text in the 2nd and 5th paragraphs of section II.H as shown in strikeout format bellow:

   The Basin Plan includes a list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), which are defined as "…*those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 CFR 130, et seq.)*." The Basin Plan also states, "*Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to WQLSs. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment*." The southern portion of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Waterways is listed as a WQLS for chloropyrifos, DDT, diazinon, electrical conductivity, exotic species, group A pesticides, mercury, and unknown toxicity in the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. Effluent limitations for mercury, ~~electrical conductivity,~~ and acute and chronic whole effluent toxicity are included in this Order.

   The Bay-Delta Plan attempts to create a management plan that is acceptable to the stakeholders while at the same time is protective of beneficial uses of the Sacramento – San Joaquin Delta. The State Water Board adopted Decision 1641 (D-1641) on 29 December 1999. D-1641 implements flow objectives for the Bay-Delta Estuary, approves a petition to change points of diversion of the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project in the Southern Delta, and approves a petition to change places of use and purposes of use of the Central Valley Project. ~~The water quality objectives of the Bay-Delta Plan are implemented as part of this Order.~~

2. **FINDINGS.** Remove the text in section II.M as shown in strikeout format bellow:

   M. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants. This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD, TSS, and pH. The WQBELs consist of restrictions on aluminum, ammonia, total coliform organisms, copper, ~~electrical conductivity,~~ methylene blue active substances, and nitrate plus nitrite. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order includes effluent limitations for pathogens to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses.

3. **LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS**. Remove the effluent limitations of electrical conductivity in Table 6 in section IV.A.1.a and Table 7 in section IV.A.2.a as shown in strikeout format below:

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
~~Electrical Conductivity (1 April to 31 August)~~	~~µmhos/cm~~	~~700~~				
~~Electrical Conductivity (1 Sept to 31 March)~~	~~µmhos/cm~~	~~1000~~				

4. **RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS.** Remove the text in section V.A.6 as shown in strikeout format bellow:

   6. ~~**Electrical Conductivity.** The running 30-day average electrical conductivity to exceed 700 µmhos/cm (1 April through 31 August) or 1000 µmhos/cm (1 September through 31 March).~~

5. **PROVISIONS.** Remove the text in section VI.C.7.a as shown in strikeout format bellow:

   a. **Compliance Schedules for Final Groundwater Limitations ~~and Exemption from Title 27 for storage of secondary effluent in Secondary Effluent Storage Pond (SESP)~~.** This Order requires compliance with the final groundwater limitations by **1 October 2014**. ~~Compliance with the groundwater limitations will result in the storage of secondary effluent in the SESP meeting the preconditions for an exemption from Title 27. Therefore, this compliance schedule temporarily exempts the Discharger from compliance with Title 27 to allow time for the Discharger to meet all preconditions for an exemption from Title 27.~~ The Discharger shall comply with the following time schedule to ensure compliance with the final groundwater limitations ~~and to demonstrate the storage of secondary effluent in the SESP is in compliance with the Basin Plan~~:

6. **Attachment F, Fact Sheet.** Remove the text in section III.F.3 as shown in strikeout format below:

   3. **Secondary Effluent Storage Pond (SESP).** The SESP holds only secondary effluent that has been treated at the Facility. The SESP has rip/rap sidings and an unlined bottom; ~~therefore, wastewater contained in the SESP potentially percolates to the underlying groundwater. Monitoring data obtained from the secondary effluent discharged to land, which is representative of the discharges to SESP, indicate that some constituents do not comply with the applicable water quality control plan. For example, the Basin Plan contains narrative objectives for chemical constituents, tastes and odors, and toxicity of groundwater. The chemical constituent objective states groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect any beneficial use. Electrical conductivity (EC) and total dissolved solids (TDS), which were found in the representative samples at monthly average effluent concentrations of 817 µmhos/cm and 575 mg/L, respectively, have the ability to degrade the underlying groundwater quality and thereby impairing agricultural use of~~

~~the groundwater. However,~~ groundwater monitoring data has not been obtained to determine whether any attenuation beneath SESP has occurred. But based on the monitoring results of the representative samples, the wastewater in the SESP does not need to be managed as Hazardous Waste. ~~Until the Discharger provides further information (e.g. underlying groundwater monitoring data or a site-specific study to determine the appropriate EC or TDS levels to protect the agricultural beneficial use in the vicinity of the Facility), the Regional Water Board cannot determine whether the wastewater stored in SESP, and thus the underlying groundwater, comply with the applicable water quality control plan. Because compliance cannot be determined immediately, this Order includes a compliance schedule to determine compliance with the applicable water quality control plan.~~

7. Attachment F, Fact Sheet. Remove the text in section IV.C.3.d and IV.C.3.d.viii as shown in strikeout format below:

d. Constituents with Reasonable Potential. The Regional Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality standard for aluminum, ammonia, mercury, methylene blue active substances (MBAS), Nitrate plus nitrite, pathogens, ~~salinity,~~ and temperature. WQBELs for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

viii. Salinity

(a) WQO. The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. ~~The State Water Board's Bay-Delta Plan establishes salinity water quality objectives as electrical conductivity at various compliance points in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to protect beneficial uses.~~ The USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate.

Table F-12. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives

Parameter	Secondary MCL	Bay-Delta Plan[1]	Effluent	
			Average	Maximum
EC (µmhos/cm)	900, 1600, 2200	~~700 (1 Apr – 31 Aug)~~ ~~1000 (1 Sep – 31 Mar)~~	731	827
TDS (mg/L)	500, 1000, 1500	N/A	450	500
Sulfate (mg/L)	250, 500, 600	N/A	57	68
Chloride (mg/L)	250, 500, 600	N/A	132	140

[1] ~~Compliance with the Bay-Delta Plan water quality objectives are determined at three monitoring locations in the South Sacramento-San Joaquin-Delta, but apply throughout the general geographic area.~~

(1) Chloride. The secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum. The USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria of 860 mg/L and 230 mg/L, respectively.

(2) Electrical Conductivity. The secondary MCL for EC is 900 µmhos/cm as a recommended level, 1600 µmhos/cm as an upper level, and 2200 µmhos/cm as a short-term maximum. The State Water Board's Bay-Delta Plan establishes water quality objectives that apply to waters of the San Francisco Bay system and the legal Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. As specified at page 10, "unless otherwise indicated, water quality objectives cited for a general area, such as for the southern Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, are applicable for all locations in that general area and compliance locations will be used to determine compliance with the cited objectives." ~~The Bay-Delta Plan's salinity objectives for the southern Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta are to protect agricultural irrigation uses, and seasonally varies from 700 µmhos/cm (1 April to 31 August) to 1000 µmhos/cm (1 September to 31 March). These objectives apply to the Facility's discharge.~~

(3) Sulfate. The secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

(4) Total Dissolved Solids. The secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

(b) RPA Results.

(1) Chloride. Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 109 mg/L to 140 mg/L, with an average of 132 mg/L. Background concentrations in San Joaquin River ranged from 9 mg/L to 150 mg/L, with an average of 69 mg/L, for 5 samples collected by the Discharger from 27 April 2004 through 30 December 2008. These levels do not exceed the secondary MCL or the USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for chloride.

(2) Electrical Conductivity. A review of the Discharger's self-monitoring reports after operation of tertiary filtration/UV disinfection show a maximum monthly average EC concentration of 783 µmhos/cm (MEC) during the months April through August (irrigation season) and a MEC of 827 µmhos/cm during the months September through March (non-irrigation season). The maximum 30-day average background receiving water EC was 949 µmhos/cm (non-irrigation season) and 763 µmhos/cm (irrigation season). These levels do not exceed the secondary MCL ~~or the non-irrigation season objective in the Bay-Delta Plan; however, these~~

~~levels exceed the irrigation season (April through August) Bay-Delta Plan salinity objective. Therefore, based on the data cited, the discharge demonstrates reasonable potential to exceed the objective~~.

(3) Sulfate. Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 43 mg/L to 68 mg/L, with an average of 57 mg/L. Background concentrations in San Joaquin River ranged from 11 mg/L to 170 mg/L, with an average of 75 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the secondary MCL. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for sulfate.

(4) Total Dissolved Solids. The average TDS effluent concentration was 450 mg/L with concentrations ranging from 396 mg/L to 500 mg/L. The background receiving water TDS was measured once at a value of 411 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the secondary MCL. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for TDS.

(c) WQBELs. Previous Order No. R5-2004-0028 originally contained seasonal EC limits of 700 and 1000 µmhos/cm, based on the Bay-Delta Plan objectives. The Discharger petitioned the Order to the State Water Board, in part, regarding the EC limits. In Order WQ 2005-0005 for the City of Manteca (Manteca Order), the State Water Board revised the seasonal EC effluent limits to only 1000 µmhos/cm on a year-round basis. The State Water Board based the revision, in part, on the following findings:

"…although discharge of treated wastewater to the Delta or its tributaries under an NPDES permit can affect EC in the southern Delta, previous State Board decisions and water quality control plans do not discuss treated effluent discharges as a source of salinity in the southern Delta."

"In the present case, the record indicates that the 700 µmhos/cm EC receiving water objective for April through August in the southern Delta frequently is not met, and that requiring the City to comply with an effluent limitation of 700 µmhos/cm EC would not significantly change the EC of water in the southern Delta area. In addition, the State Board's 1991 and 1995 Delta Plans, Revised Water Right Decision 1641, and State Board Resolution No. 2004-0062 all establish that the intended implementation program for meeting the 700 µmhos/cm EC objective was based primarily upon providing increased flows, possible construction of salinity barriers, and reducing the salt load entering the San Joaquin River from irrigation return flows and groundwater."

"The causes and potential solutions to the salinity problems in the southern Delta are highly complex subjects that have received and are continuing to receive an unprecedented amount of attention from the State Board in the exercise of its coordinated authority over water rights and water quality. The southern Delta water quality objectives for EC referenced by the Regional Board were established in the State Board's 1995 Delta Plan. Although the ultimate solutions to southern Delta salinity problems have not yet been determined, previous actions establish that the State Board intended for permit

effluent limitations to play a limited role with respect to achieving compliance with the EC water quality objectives in the southern Delta."

"…the existing record supports the conclusions that: (1) assuring compliance with the 700 µmhos/cm EC limitation in the City's permit for April through August would probably require construction and operation of a reverse osmosis treatment plant for at least a portion of the City's effluent at a very large cost; and (2) because of the relatively high salinity of the receiving water and the relatively small portion of flow provided by the City's discharge, the City's use of reverse osmosis would have relatively little effect on the EC of water in the river. In addition, the State Board takes official notice [California Code of Regulations, Title 23 Section 648.2], of the fact that operation of a large-scale reverse osmosis treatment plant would result in production of highly saline brine for which an acceptable method of disposal would have to be developed. Consequently, any decision that would require use of reverse osmosis to treat the City's municipal wastewater effluent on a large scale should involve thorough consideration of the expected environmental effects."

~~The facts regarding the need to construct reverse osmosis to meet the 700 µmhos/cm EC standard have not changed.~~ Since adoption of the Manteca Order the Discharger has replaced a portion of its groundwater supplies with lower salinity surface water from the South San Joaquin Irrigation District. Furthermore, the Discharger has removed the food processing wastewater from Eckhart Cold Storage from its waste-stream that is discharged to the San Joaquin River. As a result, salt reductions have been achieved in the effluent discharge. ~~However, the Discharger is still unable to comply with the 700 µmhos/cm EC standard required in the Bay-Delta Plan during the irrigation season.~~

~~Other facts supporting the State Water Board's conclusions have changed since adoption of the Manteca Order. The State Water Board updated the Bay-Delta Plan in 2006. The update re-affirmed the seasonal standards and updated the implementation program to include regulation of treated effluent discharges to the South Delta. Furthermore, the State Water Board held in Order WQ 2009-0003 for the City of Tracy that the Clean Water Act requires compliance with existing water quality objectives pending the development of long-term or interim regulatory solutions such as revisions to existing water quality standards, a TMDL, variances, site specific objectives, or an offset policy. (p. 10 and p. 17.) Therefore, to ensure compliance with the Bay-Delta Plan and to be consistent with the most recent State Water Board Order WQ 2009-003 (City of Tracy), this Order contains seasonal effluent limits of 700 µmhos/cm from April through August and 1000 µmhos/cm from September through March.~~

(d) Plant Performance and Attainability. Since adoption of previous Order No. R5-2004-0028, the Discharger replaced a portion of its groundwater supplies with lower salinity surface water from the South San Joaquin Irrigation District. As a result, salt reductions were achieved in the effluent discharge.

~~Nevertheless, as shown in the following table, analysis of the effluent data shows that the post upgrade MEC of 783 µg/L is greater than applicable WQBELs, and therefore,appear to put the Discharger in immediate non-compliance with the EC effluent limitation.~~

Parameter	Effluent					
	2006		2007		2008	
	Avg	Max	Avg	Max	Avg	Max
EC, µmhos/cm	904	1107	809	917	732	827
TDS, mg/L	554	617	481	554	459	500
Chloride, mg/L	137	140	N/A[1]	136	N/A	109
Sulfate, mg/L	N/A	58	N/A[1]	52	N/A	43

~~Based on the data cited and subsequent analysis, a compliance time schedule for compliance with the effluent limitations is established in TSO No. R5-2009-0096 in accordance with CWC section 13300. The TSO also requires preparation and implementation of a pollution prevention plan in compliance with CWC section 13263.3.~~

8. **Attachment F, Fact Sheet**. Remove the text in section IV.C.4.a as shown in underline/strikeout format below:

   a. This Order includes WQBELs for aluminum, ammonia, copper, methylene blue active substances, nitrate, and total coliform organisms~~, and electrical conductivity~~. The general methodology for calculating WQBELs based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.4.b through e, below. See Tables F-13 through F-15 below, for the WQBEL calculations.

9. **Attachment F, Fact Sheet**. Remove the effluent limitations for electrical conductivity in section IV.D. 5 as shown in underline/strikeout format below:

   This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD5, TSS, and pH. The WQBELs consist of restrictions on pathogens, aluminum, nitrate plus nitrite, methylene blue active substances, and ammonia~~, and electrical conductivity~~. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements.

10. Attachment F, Fact Sheet. Remove the effluent limitations of electrical conductivity in Table F-16, Table F-17, and Table F-18 as shown in strikeout format below:

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis[1]
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
~~Electrical Conductivity (1 April to 31 August)~~	~~µmhos/cm~~	~~700~~					
~~Electrical Conductivity (1 Sept to 31 March)~~	~~µmhos/cm~~	~~1000~~					

11. Attachment F, Fact Sheet. Remove the text in section IV.F.1 as shown in underline/strikeout format below:

1. **Scope and Authority.** Title 27 regulations conditionally exempt certain activities from its provisions. Several exemptions are relevant to the discharge of wastewater to land, and the operation of treatment and/or storage ponds, associated with the Facility ~~only if 1) the discharge is regulated by Waste Discharge Requirements, 2) any groundwater degradation complies with the Basin Plan and Resolution No. 68-16 (Antidegradation Policy) (refer to section V.B of this Fact Sheet for further information), and 3) it does not need to be managed as a hazardous waste. (Title 27, section 20090, et. seq.)~~.

12. Attachment G, Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis. Remove the text in the 4th page of Attachment G as shown in strikeout format below:

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Non-Conventional Pollutants											
Electrical Conductivity	µg/L	827	949	~~1000~~	None	None	None	None	Narrative	900	~~Yes~~[4]

Any person aggrieved by this action of the Central Valley Water Board may petition the State Water Board to review the action in accordance with Water Code section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 2050 and following. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., 30 days after the date of this Order, except that if the thirtieth day following the date of this Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions may be found on the Internet at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality

or will be provided upon request.

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **17 April 2015**.

Original Signed by Pamela C.Creedon

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer