

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94612
waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay

TENTATIVE ORDER R2-2021-00XX

**AMENDMENT OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR MUNICIPAL DISCHARGERS TO UPDATE TOTAL RESIDUAL CHLORINE AND
OIL AND GREASE REQUIREMENTS**

WHEREAS the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (hereinafter “Regional Water Board”), finds the following:

1. The Regional Water Board issued waste discharge requirements that serve as National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for the dischargers listed in Table 1 (hereinafter “Dischargers”). These permits authorize the Dischargers to discharge treated wastewater from their respective facilities to waters of the United States under specific conditions.
2. This Order amends the orders listed in Table 1 to update effluent limits and monitoring requirements for total residual chlorine and remove effluent limits and monitoring requirements for oil and grease.
3. The Regional Water Board developed this Order’s requirements based on available information. The Fact Sheet attached to this Order as Attachment F contains background information and rationale for this Order’s requirements. It is hereby incorporated into this Order and therefore constitutes part of the findings for this Order.
4. This Order is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to California Water Code section 13389.
5. The Regional Water Board notified the Dischargers and interested agencies and persons of its intent to consider adoption of this Order, and provided an opportunity to submit written comments.
6. In a public meeting, the Regional Water Board heard and considered all comments pertaining to this Order.

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	NPDES Permit	Primary Order	Primary Order Adoption Date	Primary Order Expiration Date	Order Contains Chlorine Limits
American Canyon, City of	CA0038768	R2-2017-0008	4/12/2017	5/31/2022	X
Benicia, City of	CA0038091	R2-2019-0034	12/11/2019	1/31/2025	X
Burlingame, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	CA0037788	R2-2018-0024	6/13/2018	7/31/2023	X
Central Marin Sanitation Agency	CA0038628	R2-2018-0003	1/10/2018	2/28/2023	X
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	CA0037648	R2-2017-0009	4/12/2017	5/31/2022	
Crockett Community Services District, Port Costa Sanitary Dept.	CA0037885	R2-2018-0053	12/12/2018	1/31/2024	X
Delta Diablo	CA0038547	R2-2019-0035	12/11/2019	1/31/2025	X
East Bay Dischargers Authority	CA0037869	R2-2017-0016	5/10/2017	6/30/2022	X
Union Sanitary District (Wet Weather Outfall)	CA0038733	R2-2020-0027	10/14/2020	11/30/2025	X

Discharger	NPDES Permit	Primary Order	Primary Order Adoption Date	Primary Order Expiration Date	Order Contains Chlorine Limits
Dublin San Ramon Services District	CA0037613	R2-2017-0017	5/10/2017	6/30/2022	X
Livermore, City of	CA0038008	R2-2017-0018	5/10/2017	6/30/2022	X
Livermore-Amador Valley Water Management Agency (Wet Weather Outfall)	CA0038679	R2-2021-0007	5/12/2021	6/30/2026	X
Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts (Wet Weather Outfall)	CA0037559	R2-2018-0010	3/14/2018	12/31/2023	X
East Bay Municipal Utility District	CA0037702	R2-2020-0024	9/9/2020	10/31/2025	X
Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District	CA0038024	R2-2020-0012	3/11/2020	4/30/2025	
Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	CA0037851	R2-2020-0022	7/8/2020	8/31/2025	X
Marin County (Paradise Cove), Sanitary District No. 5 of	CA0037427	R2-2016-0042	10/12/2016	11/30/2021	X
Marin County (Tiburon), Sanitary District No. 5 of	CA0037753	R2-2018-0038	8/8/2018	9/30/2023	X
Millbrae, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	CA0037532	R2-2019-0009	3/13/2019	4/30/2024	X
Novato Sanitary District	CA0037958	R2-2020-0019	6/10/2020	8/31/2025	
Pacifica, City of	CA0038776	R2-2017-0013	4/12/2017	5/31/2022	
Palo Alto, City of	CA0037834	R2-2019-0015	4/10/2019	5/31/2024	
Petaluma, City of	CA0037810	R2-2021-0008	5/12/2021	6/30/2026	X
Pinole, City of	CA0037796	R2-2018-0004	2/14/2018	3/31/2023	X
Rodeo Sanitary District	CA0037826	R2-2017-0034	9/13/2017	10/31/2022	X
St. Helena, City of	CA0038016	R2-2021-0004	4/14/2021	5/30/2026	X
San Francisco, City and County of (San Francisco International Airport), and North Bayside System Unit	CA0038318	R2-2018-0045	10/10/2018	11/30/2023	X
San Jose and Santa Clara, cities of	CA0037842	R2-2020-0001	2/12/2020	3/31/2025	X
San Mateo, City of	CA0037541	R2-2018-0016	5/9/2018	6/30/2023	X
Sausalito-Marín City Sanitary District	CA0038067	R2-2018-0025	6/13/2018	7/31/2023	X
Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin	CA0037711	R2-2018-0039	8/8/2018	9/30/2023	X
Silicon Valley Clean Water	CA0038369	R2-2018-0005	2/14/2018	3/31/2023	X
Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	CA0037800	R2-2019-0019	7/10/2019	8/31/2024	X
South San Francisco and San Bruno, cities of, and North Bayside System Unit	CA0038130	R2-2019-0021	7/10/2019	8/31/2024	X
Sunnyvale, City of	CA0037621	R2-2020-0002	2/2/2020	3/31/2025	X
Treasure Island Development Authority	CA0110116	R2-2020-0020	6/10/2020	7/31/2025	X
Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District	CA0037699	R2-2017-0035	9/13/2017	10/31/2022	X
West County Agency; West County Wastewater District; City of Richmond; and Richmond Municipal Sewer District No. 1	CA0038539	R2-2019-0003	2/13/2019	3/31/2024	X
Yountville, Town of	CA0038121	R2-2020-0026	10/14/2020	11/30/2025	X

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that in order to meet the provisions contained in Water Code division 7 (commencing with § 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the federal Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Dischargers listed in Table 1 shall comply with their respective orders listed in Table 1, as amended by this Order. This action in no way prevents the Regional Water Board from taking enforcement action for violations of the orders listed in Table 1.

1. The oil and grease effluent limits shall be removed from the orders listed in Table 1, except for the Treasure Island Development Authority permit (Order R2-2020-0020).
2. The oil and grease effluent monitoring requirements shall be removed from the Monitoring and Reporting Programs attached to each order listed in Table 1, except for the Treasure Island Development Authority permit (Order R2-2020-0020).
3. For the orders denoted by an “X” in the “Order Contains Chlorine Limits” column in Table 1, all total residual chlorine effluent limits shall be replaced with the one-hour average effluent limits in the table below.

Table 2. Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limits

Discharger	One-hour Average (mg/L)
American Canyon, City of	0.013
Benicia, City of	0.38
Burlingame, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	0.48
Central Marin Sanitation Agency	0.56
Crockett Community Services District, Port Costa Sanitary Dept.	0.27
Delta Diablo	0.43
East Bay Dischargers Authority	0.98
Union Sanitary District Wet Weather Outfall	0.019
Dublin San Ramon Services District	0.98
Livermore, City of	0.98
Livermore-Amador Valley Water Management Agency Wet Weather Outfall	0.019
Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts Wet Weather Outfall	0.013
East Bay Municipal Utility District	0.42
Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	0.013
Marin County (Paradise Cove), Sanitary District No. 5 of	0.57
Marin County (Tiburon), Sanitary District No. 5 of	0.82
Millbrae, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	0.47
Petaluma, City of	0.013
Pinole, City of	0.43
Rodeo Sanitary District	0.43
St. Helena, City of	0.019
San Francisco, City and County of (San Francisco International Airport), and North Bayside System Unit	0.48
San Jose and Santa Clara, cities of	0.013
San Mateo, City of	0.43
Sausalito-Marín City Sanitary District	1.1
Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin	0.82
Silicon Valley Clean Water	0.44
Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	0.013
South San Francisco and San Bruno, cities of, and North Bayside System Unit	0.48
Sunnyvale, City of	0.013
Treasure Island Development Authority	1.3

Discharger	One-hour Average (mg/L)
Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District	0.34
West County Agency; West County Wastewater District; City of Richmond; and Richmond Municipal Sewer District No. 1	1.8
Yountville, Town of	0.019

4. Except where indicated below, the facilities with chlorine limits (see Table 1) shall conduct continuous total residual chlorine monitoring at all monitoring locations where the Monitoring and Reporting Programs attached to each order listed in Table 1 require chlorine monitoring. Total residual chlorine results shall be recorded at a frequency of not less than once every five minutes.
 - a. Crockett Community Services District, Port Costa Sanitary Dept. shall collect grab samples for total residual chlorine at least three times per week;
 - b. Union Sanitary District Wet Weather Outfall shall collect grab samples for total residual chlorine at least once every two hours;
 - c. Livermore-Amador Valley Water Management Agency Wet Weather Outfall shall collect grab samples for total residual chlorine at least once every two hours;
 - d. Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts Wet Weather Outfall shall collect grab samples for total residual chlorine once every two hours; and
 - e. The City of Petaluma shall collect grab samples for total residual chlorine at least twice daily, at least four hours apart, when dechlorinating naturally through the polishing wetlands. When at least a portion of the effluent is routed through the chlorine contact chamber, effluent concentrations shall be measured continuously.
5. For continuous monitoring, the minimum level for total residual chlorine analysis shall be no greater than 0.05 mg/L. To document compliance with the minimum level, Dischargers shall calibrate continuous total residual chlorine analyzers against grab samples as frequently as necessary to maintain accurate control and reliable operation.
6. To determine compliance with the one-hour average effluent limits, Dischargers shall consider all readings recorded within each hour. The monitoring period shall begin every hour on the hour. All readings below the minimum level shall be treated as zeros for compliance determination. Dischargers shall calculate arithmetic means for each hour using all the readings for that hour. Dischargers shall report through data upload to CIWQS¹ the maximum one-hour arithmetic mean for each calendar day and any other arithmetic mean values that exceed the effluent limit. Dischargers shall retain documentation of chlorine results for at least three years.
7. Dischargers may elect to use continuous on-line monitoring systems for measuring or determining that a residual dechlorinating agent (e.g., sodium bisulfite) is present. Such monitoring systems may be used to prove that anomalous residual chlorine exceedances measured by online chlorine analyzers are false positives and are not valid total residual chlorine detections because it is chemically improbable to have chlorine present in the presence of a dechlorinating agent. If the data from continuous total residual chlorine analyzers provide convincing evidence that chlorine residual

¹ CIWQS is the California Integrated Water Quality System (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs).

exceedances are false positives, the exceedances shall not be violations of this Order's total residual chlorine effluent limits.

8. If a continuous chlorine residual monitor malfunctions or is offline for essential maintenance, the Discharger shall substitute grab samples at the frequency specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program of each order listed in Table 1 until the continuous chlorine residual monitor is back online. The Discharger shall report any substitution of grab sampling for continuous sampling in its monthly self-monitoring report.
9. This Order shall become effective November 1, 2021, or the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of Regional Water Board Resolution R2-2020-0031, whichever is later.

I hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, on **[date]**.

Michael Montgomery, Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

This Fact Sheet includes the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order. As described in Finding 3 of the Order, the Regional Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as its findings supporting the issuance of the Order.

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the Dischargers' facilities:

Table F-1. Facility Information

Discharger	Facility Contact	Mailing Address	Effluent Description	Facility Design Flow (MGD)
American Canyon, City of	Jay Atkinson, Plant Operations Manager, (707) 647-4526	151 Mezzetta Court American Canyon, CA 94503	Advanced Secondary	2.5
Benicia, City of	Jeff Gregory, Wastewater Treatment Plant Supervisor, (707) 746-4336	614 East Fifth Street Benicia, CA 94510	Secondary	4.5
Burlingame, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	Robert Spankowski, Operations Manager, (650) 333-6037	501 Primrose Burlingame, CA 04010	Secondary	5.5
Central Marin Sanitation Agency	Chris Finton, Treatment Plant Manager, (415) 459-1455 ext. 101	1301 Andersen Drive San Rafael, CA 94901	Secondary	10
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	Lori Schectel, Environmental Compliance Manager (925) 229-7143	5019 Imhoff Place Martinez, CA 945553	Secondary	53.8
Crockett Community Services District, Port Costa Sanitary Dept.	James Barnhill, Sanitary Department Manager, (510) 787-2992	P.O. Box 578 Crockett, CA 94525	Secondary	0.033
Delta Diablo	Amanda Roa, Environmental Program Manager, (925) 756-1940	2500 Pittsburg-Antioch Highway Antioch, CA 94509	Secondary	19.5
East Bay Dischargers Authority (City of Hayward, City of San Leandro, Oro Loma Sanitary District, Castro Valley Sanitary District, Union Sanitary District, Dublin San Ramon Services District, City of Livermore, and Livermore-Amador Valley Water Management Agency)	Jacqueline Zipkin, General Manager (510) 278-5910	2651 Grant Avenue San Lorenzo, CA 94580	Secondary	107.8
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Eileen White, Director of Wastewater (510) 287-1149	P.O. Box 24055 Oakland, CA 94623	Secondary	120
Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District	Meg Herston, Environmental Compliance Engineer, (707) 428-9109	1010 Chadbourne Road Fairfield, CA 94535	Advanced Secondary	23.7
Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Mel Liebmann, Plant Manager, (415) 472-1734	300 Smith Ranch Road San Rafael, CA 94903	Secondary	2.92
Marin County (Paradise Cove), Sanitary District No. 5 of	Tony Rubio, District Manager, (415) 435-1501 ext. 106	P.O. Box 227 Tiburon, CA 94920	Secondary	0.04

Discharger	Facility Contact	Mailing Address	Effluent Description	Facility Design Flow (MGD)
Marin County (Tiburon), Sanitary District No. 5 of	Tony Rubio, District Manager, (415) 435-1501 ext. 106	2001 Paradise Drive Tiburon, CA 94920	Secondary	0.98
Millbrae, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	Khee Lim, Public Works Director, (650) 259-2347	621 Magnolia Avenue Millbrae, CA 94030	Secondary	3.0
Novato Sanitary District	Sandeep Karkal, General Manager, (415) 892-1694	500 Davidson Street Novato, CA 94945	Secondary	7.0
Pacifica, City of	Louis Sun, Wastewater Operation Manager, (650) 735-4662	170 Santa Maria Avenue Pacifica, CA 94044	Advanced Secondary	4.0
Palo Alto, City of	James Allen, Plant Manager, (650) 329-2243	2501 Embarcadero Way Palo Alto, CA 94303	Advanced Secondary	39
Petaluma, City of	Matthew Pierce, Operations Supervisor, (707) 776-3726	202 N. McDowell Blvd. Petaluma, CA 94954	Secondary	6.7
Pinole, City of	Josh Binder, Plant Manager (510) 724-8964	2131 Pear Street Pinole, CA 94564	Secondary	4.06
Rodeo Sanitary District	Steve Beall, District Manager, (510) 799-2970	800 San Pablo Avenue Rodeo, CA 94572	Secondary	1.14
St. Helena, City of	Clayton Church, Acting Public Works Director, (707) 312-1208	1572 Railroad Avenue St. Helena, CA 94574	Secondary	0.50
San Francisco, City and County of (San Francisco International Airport), and North Bayside System Unit	Jennifer Acton, Environmental Operations Manager, (650) 455-9241	P.O. Box 8097 San Francisco, CA 94128	Secondary	2.2
San Jose and Santa Clara, cities of	Eric Dunlavey, Wastewater Compliance Program Manager, (408) 635-4017	700 Los Esteros Road San Jose, CA 95134	Advanced Secondary	167
San Mateo, City of	Michael Sutter, Operations Superintendent, (650) 522-7380	330 West 20 th Avenue San Mateo, CA 94403	Secondary	15.7
Sausalito-Marín City Sanitary District	Omar Arias-Montez, Chief Plant Operator, (415) 331-4712	1 East Road Sausalito, CA 94965	Secondary	1.8
Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin	Mark Grushayev, General Manager, (415) 384-4825	26 Corte Madera Avenue Mill Valley, CA 94941	Secondary	3.6
Silicon Valley Clean Water	Monte Hamamoto, Chief Operating Officer, (650) 832-6266	1400 Radio Road Redwood City, CA 94065	Secondary	29
Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Frank Mello, Operations Coordinator, (707) 521-1843	404 Aviation Blvd. Santa Rosa, CA 95403	Secondary	3.0
South San Francisco and San Bruno, cities of, and North Bayside System Unit	Brian Schumacker, Plant Superintendent, (650) 829-3844	195 Belle Air Road South San Francisco, CA 94080	Secondary	13
Sunnyvale, City of	Leonard Espinoza, Acting Water Pollution Control Plant Division Manager, (408) 730-7771	P.O. Box 3707 Sunnyvale, CA 94088	Advanced Secondary	29.5
Treasure Island Development Authority	Amy Chastain, Regulatory Compliance Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, (415) 554-1683	1 Avenue of the Palms, Suite 241 San Francisco, CA 94130	Secondary	2.0

Discharger	Facility Contact	Mailing Address	Effluent Description	Facility Design Flow (MGD)
Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District	Jennifer Harrington, Environmental Services Director, (707) 644-7806	450 Ryder Street Vallejo, CA 94590	Secondary	15.5
West County Agency; West County Wastewater District; City of Richmond; and Richmond Municipal Sewer District No. 1	Lisa Malek-Zadeh, General Manager, (510) 222-6700	2910 Hilltop Drive Richmond, CA 94806	Secondary	28.5
Yountville, Town of	Eric Sanders, Chief Plant Operator, (707) 944-2988	6550 Yount Street Yountville, CA 94599	Advanced Secondary	0.55

II. BACKGROUND

On November 18, 2020, the Regional Water Board adopted Resolution R2-2020-0031, which amended the Basin Plan to eliminate technology-based effluent limits for chlorine of 0.0 mg/L, and to establish water quality objectives for chlorine and a process to implement water quality-based effluent limits. Although U.S. EPA has not yet approved this Basin Plan amendment, Basin Plan section 3.3.23 now includes the water quality objectives for chlorine shown in the table below:

Table F-2. Chlorine Water Quality Objectives

Receiving Water Type	4-Day Average (mg/L)	1-Hour Average (mg/L)
Marine or Estuarine	0.0075	0.013
Freshwater	0.011	0.019

The permits denoted by an “X” in the “Order Contains Chlorine Limits” column in Table 1 of this Order contain total residual chlorine effluent limits based on technology-based requirements that will become obsolete when U.S. EPA approves the Basin Plan amendment. This Order establishes water quality-based effluent limits based on the new one-hour average objectives shown in Table F-2. This Order does not use the four-day average objectives to set effluent limits because chlorine dissipates quickly upon entering receiving waters. Discharges that meet effluent limits based on a one-hour average would be unlikely to cause exceedances of the four-day average objective in receiving waters.

Resolution R2-2020-0031 also eliminated technology-based effluent limits for oil and grease for treatment facilities that provide secondary or advanced secondary treatment. Wastewater that undergoes a minimum of secondary treatment should not contain significant levels of oil and grease because primary and secondary clarifiers have skimming devices that remove floatables from wastewater. Microorganisms in the biological portion of wastewater treatment will also metabolize oils attached to solids. These microorganisms settle out in secondary clarifiers. In general, biochemical oxygen demand and total suspended solids are better indicators of wastewater treatment. Because the facilities listed in Table 1 of this Order provide secondary or advanced secondary treatment, this Order eliminates effluent limits and associated monitoring requirements for oil and grease, except for the Treasure Island Development Authority treatment plant.

III. RATIONALE FOR CHANGES

A. Removal of Oil and Grease Limits. Because the Basin Plan no longer requires oil and grease effluent limits, this Order eliminates them from the permits listed in Table 1 of this Order, except for the Treasure Island Development Authority permit. The Dischargers in Table F-1 provide secondary or advanced secondary treatment and have consistently complied with the technology-based effluent limits for oil and grease. The table below presents oil and grease values from each treatment facility from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2020, with the effluent limits established in each permit. Only one violation was observed during this time, and the reported result appeared to be anomalous and was not associated with a treatment plant upset or improper operation and maintenance. More recently, the Treasure Island Development Authority reported an oil and grease exceedance in January 2021. While the cause of this exceedance is unknown, the skimming devices in the primary and secondary clarifiers at this facility have episodically been out of service. Therefore, this Order does not remove oil and grease effluent limitations from the Treasure Island Development Authority’s permit. By 2024, San Francisco plans to construct, own, operate, and maintain a new wastewater treatment plant (the Treasure Island Water Resource Recovery Facility) to replace the existing plant. The Treasure Island Development Authority plans to decommission the existing plant when the new plant becomes operational. Once the new treatment plant becomes operational, the Water Board will reconsider the need for oil and grease effluent limitations.

Table F-3. Previous Oil and Grease Effluent Limits and Monitoring Data

Discharger	Average Monthly Limit (mg/L)	Maximum Daily Limit (mg/L)	Long-Term Average (mg/L)	Highest Value (mg/L) ^[1]
American Canyon, City of	----	10	3.3	9.0
Benicia, City of	10	20	2.7	3.8
Burlingame, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	10	20	1.9	2.4
Central Marin Sanitation Agency	10	20	1.6	1.6
Crockett Community Services District, Port Costa Sanitary Dept.	10	20	1.7	6.9
Delta Diablo	10	20	1.1	1.3
East Bay Dischargers Authority	10	20	2.1	2.7
Union Sanitary District Wet Weather Outfall	----	20	----	----
Dublin San Ramon Services District ^[4]	----	----	----	----
Livermore, City of ^[4]	----	----	----	----
LAVWMA Wet Weather Outfall	----	20	ND ^[2]	ND ^[2]
Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts Wet Weather Outfall	5	10	ND ^[2]	ND ^[2]
East Bay Municipal Utility District	10	20	ND ^[2]	ND ^[2]
Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District	----	10	1.8	1.8
Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	10	20	2.1	2.4

Discharger	Average Monthly Limit (mg/L)	Maximum Daily Limit (mg/L)	Long-Term Average (mg/L)	Highest Value (mg/L) ^[1]
Marin County (Paradise Cove), Sanitary District No. 5 of	10	20	5.0	5.0
Marin County (Tiburon) Sanitary District No. 5 of	10	20	5.0	5.0
Millbrae, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	10	20	1.5	3.1
Novato Sanitary District	10	20	1.9	3.0
Pacifica, City of	5	10	0.0	0.0
Palo Alto, City of	5	10	1.6	2.3
Petaluma, City of	10	20	3.4	7.8
Pinole, City of	10	20	1.7	2.2
Rodeo Sanitary District	10	20	1.8	1.8
St. Helena, City of	10	20	3.4	4.8
San Francisco, City and County of (San Francisco International Airport), and North Bayside System Unit	10	20	1.6	2.7
San Jose and Santa Clara, Cities of	5	10	1.5	1.5
San Mateo, City of	10	20	1.6	1.6
Sausalito-Marín City Sanitary District	10	20	2.5	6.7
Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin	10	20	2.8	3.3
Silicon Valley Clean Water	10	20	2.8	4.1
Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	10	20	5.5	120 ^[3]
South San Francisco and San Bruno, Cities of, and North Bayside System Unit	10	20	2.7	16 ^[5]
Sunnyvale, City of	5	10	1.6	2.1
Treasure Island Development Authority	10	20	4.1	16 ^[5]
Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District	10	20	2.0	2.8
West County Agency; West County Wastewater District; City of Richmond; and Richmond Municipal Sewer District No. 1	10	20	4.3	9.7
Yountville, Town of	10	20	ND ^[2]	ND ^[2]

Footnotes:

^[1] The highest value is the highest reported daily maximum value.

^[2] All values were non-detect.

^[3] The cause of this high value is unknown. Since no treatment plant upset took place, the result is not believed to be representative of the effluent discharged. The next highest value was 7.6 mg/L.

^[4] The City of Livermore and Dublin San Ramon Services District are regulated for oil and grease at the East Bay Discharger's Authority deepwater outfall.

^[5] The Discharger collected additional samples to document compliance with the average monthly effluent limitation.

- B. Removal of Oil and Grease Effluent Monitoring.** Because this Order eliminates oil and grease effluent limits, and because oil and grease monitoring does not provide useful information for assessing whether a treatment plant provides secondary or advanced secondary treatment, oil and grease monitoring is unnecessary for the discharges listed in Table 1 of this Order. Therefore, this Order eliminates these monitoring requirements, except for the Treasure Island Development Authority treatment plant.
- C. Replacement of Chlorine Effluent Limits.** This Order establishes water quality-based effluent limits for total residual chlorine in accordance with Basin Plan Table 4-2. To calculate the total residual chlorine effluent limits, the Basin Plan states that adjustments to the effluent limits in Table 4-2 may be made to account for mixing zones in a manner consistent with the procedures in the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy). To account for such mixing zones, this Order uses a simplified equation from State Implementation Policy section 1.4 because background concentrations for total residual chlorine are assumed to be zero:

$$ECA = (D+1) \times C$$

Where ECA = effluent concentration allowance (effluent limit),
 D = dilution factor (parts receiving water for each part effluent)
 C = water quality objective

The table below includes the applicable water quality objective, dilution factor, and effluent limit for each Discharger. The dilution factors are explained below.

Table F-4. Water Quality Based Effluent Limits for Total Residual Chlorine

Discharger	Receiving Water Type	Water Quality Objective (mg/L)	Dilution Factor	Effluent Limit (one-hour average, mg/L)
American Canyon, City of	Estuarine	0.013	0	0.013
Benicia, City of	Estuarine	0.013	28	0.38
Burlingame, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	Marine	0.013	36	0.48
Central Marin Sanitation Agency	Estuarine	0.013	42	0.56
Crockett Community Services District, Port Costa Sanitary Dept.	Estuarine	0.013	20	0.27
Delta Diablo	Estuarine	0.013	32	0.43
East Bay Dischargers Authority	Marine	0.013	74	0.98
Union Sanitary District Wet Weather Outfall	Freshwater	0.019	0	0.019

Discharger	Receiving Water Type	Water Quality Objective (mg/L)	Dilution Factor	Effluent Limit (one-hour average, mg/L)
Dublin San Ramon Services District	Marine	0.013	78	0.98
Livermore, City of	Marine	0.013	78	0.98
Livermore-Amador Valley Water Management Agency Wet Weather Outfall	Freshwater	0.019	0	0.019
Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts Wet Weather Outfall	Marine	0.013	0	0.013
East Bay Municipal Utility District	Marine	0.013	31	0.42
Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Estuarine	0.013	0	0.013
Marin County (Paradise Cove), Sanitary District No. 5 of	Marine	0.013	43	0.57
Marin County (Tiburon), Sanitary District No. 5 of	Marine	0.013	62	0.82
Millbrae, City of, and North Bayside System Unit	Marine	0.013	35	0.47
Petaluma, City of	Estuarine	0.013	0	0.013
Pinole, City of	Estuarine	0.013	32	0.43
Rodeo Sanitary District	Estuarine	0.013	32	0.43
St. Helena, City of	Freshwater	0.019	0	0.019
San Francisco, City and County of (San Francisco International Airport), and North Bayside System Unit	Marine	0.013	36	0.48
San Jose and Santa Clara, Cities of	Estuarine	0.013	0	0.013
San Mateo, City of	Marine	0.013	32	0.43
Sausalito-Marín City Sanitary District	Marine	0.013	83	1.1
Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin	Marine	0.013	62	0.82
Silicon Valley Clean Water	Marine	0.013	33	0.44

Discharger	Receiving Water Type	Water Quality Objective (mg/L)	Dilution Factor	Effluent Limit (one-hour average, mg/L)
Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Estuarine	0.013	0	0.013
South San Francisco and San Bruno, Cities of, and North Bayside System Unit	Marine	0.013	36	0.48
Sunnyvale, City of	Estuarine	0.013	0	0.013
Treasure Island Development Authority	Marine	0.013	102	1.3
Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District	Estuarine	0.013	25	0.34
West County Agency; West County Wastewater District; City of Richmond; and Richmond Municipal Sewer District No. 1	Marine	0.013	140	1.8
Yountville, Town of	Freshwater	0.019	0	0.019

Basin Plan Table 4-2 allows total residual chlorine effluent limits to account for mixing zones in a manner consistent with the procedures in the State Implementation Policy. This Order does not establish total residual chlorine mixing zones for any shallow water discharger; thus, Table F-4 lists their dilution factors as zero. In contrast, this Order establishes total residual chlorine mixing zones for deep water dischargers based on initial dilution. These mixing zones and dilution factors are explained below and in the Fact Sheets attached to the orders listed in Table 1 of this Order. To ensure that the average exposure of aquatic organisms will not exceed the one-hour acute criterion and that total residual chlorine within these mixing zones will not be lethal to aquatic organisms, each study used to support a dilution factor greater than zero documents that an adrift organism would pass through the mixing zone within 15 minutes or less, as recommended by U.S. EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, March 1991, EPA/505/2-90-001.

1. **City of Benicia.** A study titled *Benicia WWTP Effluent Initial Dilution at Long-term Average, Design, and Peak Daily Flow Rates* (November 2012) used the U.S. EPA supported Visual Plumes model to support a minimum initial dilution of 29:1 (D=28) for acute water quality criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of less than 10 minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.
2. **North Bayside System Unit (including Burlingame, Millbrae, San Francisco International Airport, and South San Francisco and San Bruno).** These wastewater treatment plants share an outfall in Lower San Francisco Bay. A study titled *Near-field*

Mixing Zone and Dilution Analysis for the North Bayside System Unit Outfall Diffuser to Lower San Francisco Bay (May 18, 2018) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 37:1 (D=36) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of less than two minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.

3. **Central Marin Sanitation Agency.** A study titled *Mixing Zone Study Report Central Marin Sanitation Agency* (September 29, 2011) used the U.S. EPA supported Visual Plumes model to support a minimum initial dilution of 43:1 (D=42) for acute criteria. The study predicted that initial dilution would occur within 13 feet of the outfall. This short distance indicates that the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms since the travel time for organisms adrift within the receiving water is expected to be less than a few minutes.
4. **Crockett Community Services District (Port Costa).** A study titled *Near-field Mixing Zone and Dilution Analysis for the Port Costa WWTP Outfall to Carquinez Strait* (May 29, 2018) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 21:1 (D=20) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of less than one minute for an organism adrift within the receiving water.
5. **Delta Diablo.** A study titled *Mixing Zone Modeling for Delta Diablo WWTP Outfall to New York Slough – Current and Future Discharge Conditions* (August 20, 2019) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 33:1 (D=32) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of 12 minutes or less for an organism adrift within the receiving water.
6. **East Bay Dischargers Authority (including Dublin San Ramon Services District and City of Livermore).** Six wastewater treatment plants share the East Bay Dischargers Authority (EBDA) outfall. Four are regulated under Order R2-2017-0016 (the City of Hayward’s Water Pollution Control Plant, the City of San Leandro’s Water Pollution Control Plant, the Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts Water Pollution Control Plant, and the Union Sanitary District’s Wastewater Treatment Plant). Two are regulated by separate orders. The Dublin San Ramon Services District’s treatment plant is regulated under Order R2-2017-0017 and the City of Livermore’s treatment plant is regulated under Order R2-2017-0018. A study titled *East Bay Dischargers Authority Common Outfall Summary of Dilution Modeling Conditions and Results* (April 2021) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 75:1 (D=74) for acute criteria. To ensure the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the edge of mixing zone was selected using a travel time of less than 15 minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.
7. **East Bay Municipal Utility District.** A study titled *East Bay Municipal Utility District Main Wastewater Treatment Plant Outfall Dilution Study Update* (May 2020) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 32:1 (D=31) for acute criteria. To ensure the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the edge of mixing zone was selected using a travel time of less than 15 minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.

8. **Sanitary District No. 5 of Marin County (Paradise Cove).** A study titled *Mixing Zone Study Report Sanitary District No. 5 of Marin County* (January 28, 2011) used the U.S. EPA supported Visual Plumes model to support a minimum initial dilution of 44:1 (D=43) for acute criteria. The study predicted that initial dilution would occur within 10 feet of the outfall. This short distance indicates that the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms since the travel time for organisms adrift within the receiving water is expected to be less than a few minutes.
9. **Sanitary District No. 5 of Marin County (Tiburon) and Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin.** These two wastewater treatment plants share an outfall in Raccoon Strait (within Central San Francisco Bay). A study titled *Mixing Zone and Dilution Credit Study for the Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin and Sanitary District No. 5 of Marin County Combined Outfall Diffuser* (July 2, 2020) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 63:1 (D=62) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of about eight minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.
10. **City of Pinole and Rodeo Sanitary District.** These two wastewater treatment plants share an outfall in San Pablo Bay. A study titled *Near-field Mixing Zone and Dilution Analysis for Chronic Toxicity Discharge Conditions and Current Diffuser Characteristics* (April 14, 2017) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 33:1 (D=32) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of about seven minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.
11. **City of San Mateo.** A study titled *Dilution Modeling Results for San Mateo Wastewater Treatment Plant Discharge to San Francisco Bay* (July 31, 2007) used the U.S. EPA supported Visual Plumes model to support a minimum initial dilution of 33:1 (D=32) for acute criteria. The study predicted that initial dilution would occur within about 20 feet of the outfall. This short distance indicates that the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms since the travel time for organisms adrift within the receiving water is expected to be less than a few minutes.
12. **Sausalito-Marín City Sanitary District.** A study titled *Dilution Modeling Results for Sausalito-Marín City Sanitary District Discharge to San Francisco Bay* (July 5, 2007) used the U.S. EPA supported Visual Plumes model to support a minimum initial dilution of 84:1 (D=83) for acute criteria. The study predicted that initial dilution would occur within about 20 feet of the outfall. This short distance indicates that the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms since the travel time for organisms adrift within the receiving water is expected to be less than a few minutes.
13. **Silicon Valley Clean Water.** A study titled *Near-field Mixing Zone for the SBSA Deep Water Outfall Diffuser in San Francisco Bay* (June 1, 2011) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 34:1 (D=33) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of about three minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.

14. **Treasure Island Development Authority.** A study titled *Dilution Model for the Treasure Island Outfall* (September 8, 2009) used the U.S. EPA supported Visual Plumes model to support a minimum initial dilution of 103:1 (D=102) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study indicated that the plume attains a maximum initial dilution within a few minutes.
15. **Vallejo Flood and Wastewater District.** A study titled *Mixing Zone Study Report for Mare Island Strait Diffuser* (July 18, 2014) used the U.S. EPA supported Visual Plumes model to support a minimum initial dilution of 26:1 (D=25) for acute criteria. The study predicted that initial dilution would occur within about 40 feet of the outfall. This short distance indicates that the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms since the travel time for organisms adrift within the receiving water is expected to be less than a few minutes.
16. **West County Agency (including West County Wastewater District and City of Richmond).** These two wastewater treatment plants share an outfall in Central San Francisco Bay. A study titled *West County Agency Common Outfall Summary of Dilution Modeling Conditions and Results* (May 2021) used the U.S. EPA approved CORMIX model to support a minimum initial dilution of 141:1 (D=140) for acute criteria. To confirm the mixing zone would not be lethal to aquatic organisms, the study estimated a travel time of about eight minutes for an organism adrift within the receiving water.

D. Revision of Chlorine Monitoring Requirements. In accordance with Water Code section 13383 and Basin Plan Table 4-2, this Order revises the chlorine monitoring requirements of the permits denoted by an “X” in the “Order Contains Chlorine Limits” column in Table 1 of this Order. This Order replaces all monitoring requirements for chlorine except for how frequently dischargers must collect grab samples if continuous analyzers are offline. To ensure that dischargers carefully manage chlorine and dechlorination dosing, Basin Plan Table 4-2 indicates that dischargers should conduct continuous monitoring to assess compliance with the total residual chlorine effluent limits, which are expressed as one-hour averages. Table 4-2 also specifies that the minimum level for continuous devices must not be greater than 0.05 mg/L and that measured values below the minimum level should be treated as zeros. Since continuous monitoring devices can sometimes report false positive values, this Order allows Dischargers to use on-line monitoring systems to measure the presence of a dechlorinating agent (e.g., sodium bisulfite). The presence of a dechlorinating agent may be used to prove that anomalous chlorine results are false positives and not valid detections because it is chemically improbable to have chlorine present in the presence of a dechlorinating agent. If a continuous chlorine residual monitor malfunctions or is offline for essential maintenance, this Order allows dischargers to substitute grab samples at the frequency specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program of each order listed in Table 1 until the continuous chlorine residual monitor is back online.

In some cases, dischargers are unable to continuously monitor chlorine. Basin Plan Table 4-2 allows less frequent monitoring for smaller, seasonal, or intermittent discharge facilities, or for facilities that rely on natural dechlorination in ponds or wetlands rather than chemical addition. These dischargers may collect grab samples instead. The table below includes the discharger, basis for its exception from continuous chlorine monitoring, and how frequently grab samples must be collected.

Table F-5. Continuous Chlorine Monitoring Exceptions

Discharger	Basis for Exception	Minimum Grab Sampling Frequency
City of Petaluma	This facility discharges seasonally and uses natural dechlorination by routing effluent through polishing wetlands.	Twice daily, at least four hours apart, when dechlorinating through the polishing wetlands.
Crockett Community Services District, Port Costa Sanitary Dept.	This is a small facility. It has a dry weather design capacity of 33,000 gallons per day.	Three times per week
Livermore-Amador Valley Water Management Agency Wet Weather Outfall	This facility only discharges intermittently during wet weather.	Once every two hours
Union Sanitary District Wet Weather Outfall	This facility only discharges intermittently during wet weather	Once every two hours
Oro Loma and Castro Valley Sanitary Districts Wet Weather Outfall	This facility only discharges intermittently during wet weather	Once every two hours

IV. DISCHARGE REQUIREMENT CONSIDERATIONS

- A. Anti-backsliding.** The term “anti-backsliding” refers to statutory and regulatory provisions that prohibit, except in limited circumstances, the renewal, reissuance, or modification of an existing NPDES permit to contain effluent limitations, permit conditions, or standards less stringent than those established in the previous order (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l); 33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(1).) While this Order does not retain effluent limits for oil and grease and relaxes total residual chlorine effluent limits, this backsliding meets an exception to the prohibition against backsliding. Clean Water Act section 402(o) prohibits backsliding from an effluent limitation that is based on state standards, such as water quality standards or treatment standards, unless the change is consistent with Clean Water Act section 303(d)(4). Here, the previous oil and grease and total residual chlorine effluent limitations were based on State treatment standards, but backsliding is allowed by Clean Water Act section 303(d)(4) because the surface waters of the San Francisco Bay region are not impaired by chlorine or oil and grease. Therefore, Clean Water Act section 303(d)(4) allows these effluent limits to be relaxed if doing so is consistent with antidegradation policies. As explained below, this Order complies with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.
- B. Antidegradation.** Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 require that state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with federal requirements. The State Water Board’s “Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California” (Resolution No. 68-16) sets forth California’s antidegradation policy. Where the federal antidegradation policy is applicable, the State Water Board has interpreted Resolution No. 68-16 to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy. A permitted discharge must be

consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. These policies require that high quality waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The discharges authorized by this Order are consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

1. **Federal Antidegradation Provisions.** Compliance with the federal antidegradation policy requires consideration of the following. First, the Regional Water Board must ensure that “existing instream uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses” are maintained and protected. Second, if the baseline quality of a waterbody for a given constituent “exceeds levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water, that quality shall be maintained and protected” through the requirements of the Order unless the Regional Water Board makes findings that (1) any lowering of the water quality is “necessary to accommodate important economic or social development in the area in which the waters are located”; (2) “water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully” is assured; and (3) “the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and all cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control” are achieved. Before allowing any lowering of high quality water, the Regional Water Board must conduct an analysis of alternatives that evaluates practicable alternatives that would prevent or lessen the degradation associated with the discharges permitted. In the context of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12(a)(2)(ii), practicable means “technologically possible, able to be put into practice, and economically viable.”

Here, the new chlorine effluent limitations are consistent with the federal antidegradation provisions. The new limitations implement the total residual chlorine water quality objectives, which were derived to be protective of aquatic life. The modest lowering of water quality continues to fully protect uses while reducing water quality impacts associated with dechlorination chemicals and accommodating the important public interest in reducing expenditures on those chemicals and freeing those resources for other vital public uses. The following alternatives analysis evaluates practicable alternatives that would prevent or lessen the degradation associated with the permitted discharges.

- a. **Continuation of the status quo.** Dischargers could continue to overdose with dechlorination chemicals. This option will likely be implemented by shallow-water dischargers whose discharges do not receive adequate initial dilution. Although it would be practicable for deepwater dischargers to continue overdosing, it is associated with negative water quality and economic impacts. Specifically, residual dechlorination chemicals in discharges generate biological oxygen demand and excess use of these chemicals cost the largest 13 dischargers an estimated \$1.4 million per year (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board: *Proposed Basin Plan Amendment: Chlorine Water Quality Objectives and Total Residual Chlorine Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations for Wastewater Discharges, Draft Staff Report*, November 18, 2020). These funds could be better invested in other important water quality projects.
- b. **Implementation of water quality objectives.** Under this alternative, deepwater Dischargers would adhere to the water quality-based effluent limitations in this Order, which would permit them to stop overdosing with dechlorination chemicals. This

alternative would avoid the negative consequences of discharging excess dechlorination chemicals while still protecting beneficial uses. This option would also free up \$1.4 million per year and reduce emissions associated with deliveries of excess dechlorination chemicals.

2. **State Antidegradation Policy.** California’s “Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California,” adopted on October 28, 1968, through Resolution 68-16 serves as the State’s Antidegradation Policy. Where a receiving water is of higher quality than applicable water quality standards, the higher water quality must be maintained unless certain conditions are met. Any decrease in water quality must be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State, must not unreasonably affect any current or anticipated beneficial uses, and must not result in lower water quality than that prescribed in the policies. Activities that produce an increased volume or concentration of waste and that discharge to existing high quality waters must meet waste discharge requirements that will “result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.”

The effluent limitations authorized by this Order are consistent with Resolution No. 68-18. This Order authorizes higher total residual chlorine limits, although the increases are unlikely to be observable in the receiving waters, particularly outside the total residual chlorine mixing zones, both because chlorine dissipates rapidly in receiving water and because the new effluent limitations are water quality-based. The modest increase in chlorine discharge is consistent with the maximum benefit of the people of the State because it will reduce the use and discharge of dechlorination chemicals, which generate greenhouse gas emissions during manufacturing and delivery, place oxygen demands on receiving waters when discharged, and generate additional costs for dischargers. The revised chlorine objectives thus reflect the updated understanding that overdosing with dechlorination chemicals is no longer the best practicable treatment or control of chlorine because of its adverse impacts to water quality. Compliance with the new effluent limitations will not unreasonably affect current or anticipated beneficial uses because the objectives they implement were developed by U.S. EPA and are protective of water quality and aquatic life. In addition, with few exceptions, this Order requires continuous monitoring to assess whether discharges comply with the new limits based on a one-hour average.

The elimination of the oil and grease effluent limits is also consistent with Resolution No. 68-16. The elimination of these limits is not expected to result in an increased volume or concentration of oil and grease in the discharge because those limits did not drive the secondary or advanced secondary treatment performance at the facilities listed in Table 1 of the Order.

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- A. **Notification of Interested Parties.** The Regional Water Board notified the dischargers listed in Table 1 of the Order, and other interested agencies and persons, of its intent to amend the permits listed in Table 1, and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Regional Water Board’s website at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay>.

B. Written Comments. Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning the tentative permit amendment as explained through the notification process. Comments were to be submitted either in person, by-email, or by mail to the attention of Robert Schlipf. Written comments were due at the Regional Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on **August 20, 2021**.

C. Public Hearing. The Regional Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative permit amendment during its meeting at the following date and time:

Date: **October 13, 2021**

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Contact: Robert Schlipf, (510) 622-2478, Robert.Schlipf@waterboards.ca.gov.

Interested persons were provided notice of the hearing and information on how to participate. During the public hearing, the Regional Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the tentative permit amendment.

Dates and venues can change. The current agenda and any changes are posted on the Regional Water Board web address is <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay>.

D. Reconsideration of Amendment. Any person aggrieved by the Regional Water Board action may petition the State Water Board to review the action in accordance with Water Code section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 2050. The State Water Board must receive the petition at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Regional Water Board action:

State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Chief Counsel
P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

A petition may also be filed by email at waterqualitypetitions@waterboards.ca.gov.

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml.

E. Information and Copying. Supporting documents and comments received are on file. To review these documents, contact Melinda Wong the Regional Water Board's custodian of records by calling (510) 622-2300 or emailing Melinda.Wong@waterboards.ca.gov. Document copying may be arranged.

F. Register of Interested Persons. Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding NPDES permits should contact the Regional Water Board and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information. Requests for additional information or questions regarding this Order should be directed to Robert Schlipf at (510) 622-2478 or Robert.Schlipf@waterboards.ca.gov.