

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION**

1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94612
waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay

TENTATIVE ORDER R2-2022-00XX
NPDES PERMIT CA0037826

The following Discharger is subject to the waste discharge requirements (WDRs) set forth in this Order:

Discharger **Rodeo Sanitary District**
Name of Facility **Rodeo Sanitary District Water Pollution Control Facility
and its collection system**
Facility Address **800 San Pablo Avenue
Rodeo, CA 94572
Contra Costa County**

Table 1. Discharge Locations

| Discharge Point | Effluent Description | Discharge Point Latitude (North-South) | Discharge Point Longitude (East-West) | Receiving Water |
|------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------|
| 001 | Secondary-Treated Municipal Wastewater | 38.0517° | -122.2700° | San Pablo Bay |

This Order was adopted on: **December 14, 2022**
This Order shall become effective on: **February 1, 2023**
This Order shall expire on: **January 31, 2028**
CIWQS regulatory measure number: **XXXXXX**

The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as an application for updated WDRs in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than **May 1, 2027**. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (Regional Water Board) have classified this discharge as “**major**.”

I hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the Regional Water Board on the date indicated above.

Eileen White, Executive Officer

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. FACILITY INFORMATION..... | 3 |
| 2. FINDINGS..... | 3 |
| 3. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS..... | 4 |
| 4. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS | 4 |
| 5. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS..... | 6 |
| 6. PROVISIONS..... | 7 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|-----------|
| TABLE 1. DISCHARGE LOCATIONS | 1 |
| TABLE 2. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS | 4 |
| TABLE 3. COPPER ACTION PLAN | 13 |
| TABLE 4. CYANIDE ACTION PLAN | 13 |

ATTACHMENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS | A-1 |
| ATTACHMENT B – MAPS..... | B-1 |
| ATTACHMENT C – PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM..... | C-1 |
| ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS | D-1 |
| ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM | E-1 |
| ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET..... | F-1 |
| ATTACHMENT G – REGIONAL STANDARD PROVISIONS, AND MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS (SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D) | G-1 |

1. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the Rodeo Sanitary District Water Pollution Control Facility and its wastewater collection system (collectively, Facility) is summarized on the cover page and in Fact Sheet (Attachment F) sections 1 and 2. Fact Sheet section 1 also includes information regarding the permit application.

2. FINDINGS

The Regional Water Board finds the following:

- 2.1. Legal Authorities.** This Order serves as WDRs pursuant to California Water Code article 4, chapter 4, division 7 (commencing with § 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to federal Clean Water Act (CWA) section 402 and implementing regulations adopted by U.S. EPA and Water Code chapter 5.5, division 7 (commencing with § 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit authorizing the Discharger to discharge into waters of the United States as described in Table 1 subject to the WDRs in this Order.
- 2.2. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Regional Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information the Discharger submitted as part of its application, information obtained through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order and is hereby incorporated into and constitutes findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G are also incorporated into this Order.
- 2.3. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Regional Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe these WDRs and has provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Fact Sheet section 8.1 provides details regarding the notification.
- 2.4. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Regional Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Fact Sheet section 8.3 provides details regarding the public hearing.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R2-2017-0034 (previous order) as amended by R2-2021-0019 and R2-2021-0028 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order, except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in Water Code division 7 (commencing with § 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Regional Water Board from taking enforcement action for violations of the previous order.

3. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- 3.1. Discharge of treated or partially-treated wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in this Order is prohibited.
- 3.2. Bypass of untreated or partially-treated wastewater to waters of the United States is prohibited, except as provided for in Attachment D section 1.7.
- 3.3. Discharge at Discharge Point 001 is prohibited when treated wastewater does not receive an initial dilution of at least 75:1, as modeled. Compliance shall be achieved by proper operation and maintenance of the discharge outfall to ensure that it (or its replacement, in whole or part) is in good working order and is consistent with or can achieve better mixing than that described in Fact Sheet section 4.3.4.2. The Discharger shall address measures taken to ensure this in its application for permit reissuance.
- 3.4. Average dry weather influent flow in excess of 1.14 MGD is prohibited. Average dry weather influent flow shall be determined from three consecutive dry weather months each year, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location INF-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP, Attachment E).
- 3.5. Any sanitary sewer overflow that results in a discharge of untreated or partially treated wastewater to waters of the United States is prohibited.

4. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS

- 4.1. **Effluent Limitations.** The discharge at Discharge Point 001 shall meet the following effluent limitations, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 or EFF-001D as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP, Attachment E):

Table 2. Effluent Limitations

| Parameter | Units | Average Monthly | Average Weekly | Maximum Daily | Instantaneous Minimum | Instantaneous Maximum |
|---|----------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C) | mg/L | 25 | 40 | - | - | - |
| Total Suspended Solids | mg/L | 30 | 45 | - | - | - |
| pH ^[1] | standard units | - | - | - | 6.0 | 9.0 |
| Chlorine, Total Residual | mg/L | - | - | - | - | 0.0 ^[2] |
| Ammonia, Total | mg/L | 54 | - | 140 | - | - |
| Copper, Total Recoverable | µg/L | 71 | - | 120 | - | - |
| Cyanide, Total | µg/L | 20 | - | 34 | - | - |
| Chlorodibromomethane | µg/L | 340 | - | 680 | - | - |
| Dioxin-TEQ | µg/L | 1.4 x 10 ⁻⁸ | - | 2.8 x 10 ⁻⁸ | - | - |

Footnotes:

- ^[1] If the Discharger monitors pH continuously, pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 401.17 the Discharger shall be in compliance with this pH limitation provided that both of the following conditions are satisfied: (i) the total time during which the pH is outside the required range shall not exceed 7 hours and 26 minutes in any calendar month; and (ii) no individual excursion from the required pH range shall exceed 60 minutes.
- ^[2] This instantaneous maximum total residual chlorine effluent limitation shall be replaced by a one-hour average effluent limitation of 0.43 mg/L on the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the chlorine water quality objectives set forth in Regional Water Board Resolution R2-2020-0031.

4.2. Percent Removal. The average monthly percent removal of carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand (CBOD) and total suspended solids (TSS) at Discharge Point 001 shall not be less than 85 percent (i.e., in each calendar month, the arithmetic mean of CBOD and TSS, by concentration, of effluent samples collected at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the MRP shall not exceed 15 percent of the arithmetic mean of the CBOD and TSS, by concentration, for influent samples collected at Monitoring Location INF-001 as described in the MRP at approximately the same times during the same period).

4.3. Enterococcus Bacteria. The discharge at Discharge Point 001 shall meet the following enterococcus effluent limitations, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001D, as described in the MRP:

- 4.3.1. The six-week rolling geometric mean of enterococcus bacteria, calculated weekly, shall not exceed 260 colony forming units per 100 milliliters (CFU/100 mL). Compliance with this limit shall be determined weekly by calculating the geometric mean of all enterococcus sample results from the past six weeks; and
- 4.3.2. No more than 10 percent of all enterococcus bacteria samples collected in a calendar month shall exceed 1,100 CFU/100 mL. Compliance with this limit shall be determined based on measured sample results. The Discharger shall not report interpolated results. If the Discharger has 9 or fewer sample results in a calendar month, compliance shall be based on the highest result. If the Discharger has 10 to 19 sample results, compliance shall be based on the second highest result, and so on.

4.4. Whole Effluent Acute Toxicity (Prior to U.S. EPA Approval of Toxicity Provisions). The discharge at Discharge Point 001 shall comply with the following acute toxicity effluent limitations until the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the State Water Board's *State Policy for Water Quality Control: Toxicity Provisions* (Toxicity Provisions), at which point these limits shall no longer apply. Compliance shall be measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001, as described in the MRP. If the Discharger can demonstrate that toxicity exceeding these acute toxicity limits is caused solely by ammonia and that the ammonia in the discharge complies with the ammonia effluent limits in Table 2 of this Order, then such toxicity shall not constitute a violation of these acute toxicity limits.

- 4.4.1. The three-sample median shall not exhibit less than 90 percent survival (i.e., a bioassay test showing survival of less than 90 percent shall represent a

violation of this effluent limitation if one or more the past two bioassay tests also show less than 90 percent survival); and

- 4.4.2. The single-sample value shall not exhibit less than 70 percent survival (i.e., a bioassay showing survival of less than 70 percent shall represent a violation of this effluent limitation).

5. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

- 5.1.** The discharge shall not cause the following conditions at any place in receiving waters:

- 5.1.1. Floating material, including solids, liquids, foams, and scum, in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses;
- 5.1.2. Alteration of suspended sediment in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses or detrimental increase in the concentrations of toxic pollutants in sediments or aquatic life;
- 5.1.3. Suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses;
- 5.1.4. Bottom deposits or aquatic growths to the extent that such deposits or growths cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses;
- 5.1.5. Alteration of temperature beyond present natural background levels unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board that such alteration in temperature does not adversely affect beneficial uses;
- 5.1.6. Changes in turbidity that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses, or increases from normal background light penetration or turbidity greater than 10 percent in areas where natural turbidity is greater than 50 nephelometric turbidity units, or above 55 nephelometric turbidity units in areas where natural turbidity is less than or equal to 50 nephelometric turbidity units;
- 5.1.7. Coloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses;
- 5.1.8. Visible, floating, suspended, or deposited oil or other products of petroleum origin; or
- 5.1.9. Toxic or other deleterious substances in concentrations or quantities that cause deleterious effects on wildlife, waterfowl, or other aquatic biota, or render any of these unfit for human consumption, either at levels created in the receiving waters or as a result of biological concentration.

- 5.2.** The discharge shall not cause the following limits to be exceeded at any place in receiving waters within one foot of the water surface:

5.2.1. Dissolved Oxygen 5.0 mg/L, minimum

The median dissolved oxygen concentration for any three consecutive months shall not be less than 80 percent of the dissolved oxygen content at saturation. When natural factors cause concentrations less than that specified above, the discharge shall not cause further reduction in ambient dissolved oxygen concentrations.

5.2.2. Dissolved Sulfide Natural background levels

5.2.3. pH The pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5. The discharge shall not cause changes greater than 0.5 pH units in normal ambient pH levels.

5.2.4. Nutrients Waters shall not contain biostimulatory substances in concentrations that promote aquatic growths to the extent that such growths cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

5.3. The discharge shall not cause a violation of any water quality standard for receiving waters adopted by the Regional Water Board or State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) as required by the CWA and regulations adopted thereunder beyond any mixing zone established through this Order. If more stringent water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to CWA section 303, or amendments thereto, the Regional Water Board may revise or modify this Order in accordance with the more stringent standards.

6. PROVISIONS

6.1. Standard Provisions

6.1.1. The Discharger shall comply with all “Standard Provisions” in Attachment D.

6.1.2. The Discharger shall comply with all applicable provisions of the “Regional Standard Provisions, and Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for NPDES Wastewater Discharge Permits” in Attachment G.

6.1.3. If there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions in this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply.

6.2. Monitoring and Reporting Provisions

The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP, Attachment E) and future revisions thereto, and applicable monitoring and reporting requirements in Attachments D and G.

6.3. Special Provisions

6.3.1. **Reopener Provisions.** The Regional Water Board may modify or reopen this Order prior to its expiration date in any of the following circumstances as allowed by law or as otherwise authorized by law. The Discharger may request a permit modification based on any of these circumstances. With any such request, the Discharger shall include antidegradation and anti-backsliding analyses as necessary.

6.3.1.1. If present or future investigations demonstrate that the discharges governed by this Order have or will have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to adverse impacts on water quality or beneficial uses of the receiving waters;

6.3.1.2. If new or revised water quality objectives or total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) come into effect for San Francisco Bay or contiguous water bodies (whether statewide, regional, or site-specific). In such cases, effluent limitations in this Order may be modified as necessary to reflect the updated water quality objectives or wasteload allocations. Adoption of the effluent limitations in this Order is not intended to restrict in any way future modifications based on legally-adopted water quality objectives or TMDLs or as otherwise permitted under federal regulations governing NPDES permit modifications;

6.3.1.3. If translator, dilution, or other water quality studies provide a basis for determining that a permit condition should be modified;

6.3.1.4. If a State Water Board precedential decision, new policy, new law, or new regulation is adopted;

6.3.1.5. If an administrative or judicial decision on a separate NPDES permit or WDRs addresses requirements similar to this discharge; or

6.3.1.6. If the Discharger requests adjustments in effluent limits due to the implementation of stormwater diversion pursuant to the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit (NPDES Permit CAS612008) for redirecting dry weather and first flush discharges from a storm drain system to the sanitary sewer system as a stormwater pollutant control strategy.

6.3.2. Effluent Characterization Study and Report

6.3.2.1. **Study Elements.** The Discharger shall characterize and evaluate the discharge from Discharge Point 001 as required by the MRP to verify that the reasonable potential analysis conclusions of this Order remain valid and to inform the next permit reissuance. If concentrations of any of the priority pollutants listed in Attachment G, Table B, significantly increase over past performance, the Discharger shall investigate the cause of any such

increase. The investigation may include, but need not be limited to, an increase in monitoring frequency, monitoring of internal process streams, and monitoring of influent sources. The Discharger shall establish remedial measures addressing any increase resulting in reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality objectives. This requirement may be satisfied through identification of the constituent as a “pollutant of concern” in the Discharger’s Pollutant Minimization Program, described in Provision 6.3.3.

- 6.3.2.2. **Reporting Requirements.** The Discharger shall summarize the data evaluation and any applicable source investigation in the annual self-monitoring report associated with the year in which samples were collected. The Discharger shall also report the pollutants detected at or above applicable water quality objectives (see Fact Sheet Table F-7 for the objectives) in the report’s transmittal letter. This requirement does not apply to pollutants with effluent limitations (see Table 2 of this Order).

6.3.3. **Pollutant Minimization Program**

- 6.3.3.1. The Discharger shall continue to improve its existing Pollutant Minimization Program to promote minimization of pollutant loadings to the treatment plant and therefore to the receiving waters.
- 6.3.3.2. The Discharger shall submit an annual report no later than **February 28** of each calendar year. Each annual report shall include at least the following information:
- 6.3.3.2.1. **Brief description of treatment plant.** The description shall include the service area and treatment plant processes.
- 6.3.3.2.2. **Discussion of current pollutants of concern.** Periodically, the Discharger shall analyze its circumstances to determine which pollutants are currently a problem and which pollutants may be potential future problems. This discussion shall include the reasons for choosing the pollutants.
- 6.3.3.2.3. **Identification of sources for pollutants of concern.** This discussion shall include how the Discharger intends to estimate and identify pollutant sources. The Discharger shall include sources or potential sources not directly within the ability or authority of the Discharger to control, such as pollutants in the potable water supply and air deposition.
- 6.3.3.2.4. **Identification of tasks to reduce the sources of pollutants of concern.** This discussion shall identify and prioritize tasks to address the Discharger’s pollutants of concern. The Discharger may implement the tasks by itself or participate in group, regional, or national tasks that address its pollutants of concern. The Discharger is strongly encouraged

to participate in group, regional, or national tasks that address its pollutants of concern whenever it is efficient and appropriate to do so. An implementation timeline shall be included for each task.

- 6.3.3.2.5. **Outreach to employees.** The Discharger shall inform employees about the pollutants of concern, potential sources, and how they might be able to help reduce the discharge of these pollutants of concern into the Facility. The Discharger may provide a forum for employees to provide input.
- 6.3.3.2.6. **Continuation of Public Outreach Program.** The Discharger shall prepare a pollution prevention public outreach program for its service area. Outreach may include participation in existing community events, such as county fairs; initiating new community events, such as displays and contests during Pollution Prevention Week; conducting school outreach programs; conducting plant tours; and providing public information in newspaper articles or advertisements, radio or television stories or spots, newsletters, utility bill inserts, or web sites. Information shall be specific to target audiences. The Discharger shall coordinate with other agencies as appropriate.
- 6.3.3.2.7. **Discussion of criteria used to measure Pollutant Minimization Program and task effectiveness.** The Discharger shall establish criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of its Pollutant Minimization Program. This discussion shall identify the specific criteria used to measure the effectiveness of each task in Provisions 6.3.3.2.3, 6.3.3.2.4, 6.3.3.2.5, and 6.3.3.2.6.
- 6.3.3.2.8. **Documentation of efforts and progress.** This discussion shall detail all of the Discharger's Pollutant Minimization Program activities during the reporting year.
- 6.3.3.2.9. **Evaluation of Pollutant Minimization Program and task effectiveness.** The Discharger shall use the criteria established in Provision 6.3.3.2.7 to evaluate the program and task effectiveness.
- 6.3.3.2.10. **Identification of specific tasks and timelines for future efforts.** Based on the evaluation, the Discharger shall explain how it intends to continue or change its tasks to more effectively reduce the amount of pollutants flowing to the treatment plant, and subsequently in its effluent.
- 6.3.3.3. The Discharger shall develop and conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program as described below when there is evidence that a priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation (e.g., sample results reported as detected but not quantified [DNQ] when the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit [MDL], sample results from analytical methods more sensitive than those methods required by this Order, presence of whole

effluent toxicity, health advisories for fish consumption, or results of benthic or aquatic organism tissue sampling) and either:

- 6.3.3.3.1. A sample result is reported as DNQ and the effluent limitation is less than the Reporting Level (RL); or
- 6.3.3.3.2. A sample result is reported as not detected (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the MDL, using definitions described in Attachment A and reporting protocols described in the MRP.
- 6.3.3.4. If triggered for a reason set forth in Provision 6.3.3.3, above, the Discharger's Pollutant Minimization Program shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions and submittals:
 - 6.3.3.4.1. An annual review and semi-annual monitoring of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutants, which may include fish tissue monitoring and other bio-uptake sampling, or alternative measures when source monitoring is unlikely to produce useful analytical data;
 - 6.3.3.4.2. Quarterly monitoring for the reportable priority pollutants in the influent to the wastewater treatment system. The Executive Officer may approve alternative measures when influent monitoring is unlikely to produce useful analytical data;
 - 6.3.3.4.3. Submittal of a control strategy designed to proceed toward the goal of maintaining concentrations of the reportable priority pollutants in the effluent at or below the effluent limitation;
 - 6.3.3.4.4. Implementation of appropriate cost-effective control measures for the reportable priority pollutants, consistent with the control strategy; and
 - 6.3.3.4.5. Inclusion of the following specific items within the annual report required by Provision 6.3.3.2, above:
 - 6.3.3.4.5.1. All Pollutant Minimization Program monitoring results for the previous year;
 - 6.3.3.4.5.2. List of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutants;
 - 6.3.3.4.5.3. Summary of all actions undertaken pursuant to the control strategy; and
 - 6.3.3.4.5.4. Description of actions to be taken in the following year.

6.3.4. **Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works**

6.3.4.1. **Sludge and Biosolids Management**

- 6.3.4.1.1. Sludge and biosolids treatment and storage shall not create a nuisance, such as objectionable odors or flies, or result in groundwater contamination.
- 6.3.4.1.2. The sludge and biosolids treatment and storage site shall have facilities adequate to divert surface runoff from adjacent areas, to protect site boundaries from erosion, and to prevent conditions that would cause drainage from the stored materials. Adequate protection is defined as protection from at least a 100-year storm and the highest possible tidal stage that may occur.
- 6.3.4.1.3. This Order does not authorize permanent onsite sludge or biosolids storage or disposal. The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge and bring the site into compliance with applicable regulations prior to commencement of any such activity.

- 6.3.4.2. **Collection System Management.** The Discharger shall properly operate and maintain its collection system (see Attachments D and G, section 1.4), report any noncompliance with respect to its collection system (see Attachment D, section 5.5.1, and Attachment G, sections 5.5.1 and 5.5.2), and mitigate any discharges in violation of this Order associated with its collection system (see Attachments D and G, section 1.3).

State Water Board Order 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC (statewide WDRs), contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows. The statewide WDRs clearly and specifically stipulate requirements for operation and maintenance and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows. Implementing the requirements for operation and maintenance and mitigation of sanitary sewer overflows set forth in the statewide WDRs (and any subsequent order updating these requirements) shall satisfy the corresponding federal NPDES requirements specified in Attachments D and G of this Order for the collection systems. Following the reporting requirements set forth in the statewide WDRs (and any subsequent order updating those requirements) shall satisfy the NPDES reporting requirements for sanitary sewer overflows specified in Attachments D and G.

6.3.5. Other Special Provisions

- 6.3.5.1. **Copper Action Plan.** The Discharger shall implement source control and pollution prevention for copper in accordance with the following tasks and time schedule:

Table 3. Copper Action Plan

| Task No. | Task | Deadline |
|----------|---|--|
| 1 | Implement Copper Control Program. Continue implementing existing program to reduce identified copper sources. | Implementation shall be ongoing |
| 2 | Implement Additional Actions. If the Regional Water Board notifies the Discharger that the three-year rolling mean dissolved copper concentration in San Pablo Bay exceeds 3.0 µg/L, then within 90 days of the notification, evaluate the effluent copper concentration trend and, if it is increasing, develop and begin implementation of additional measures to control copper discharges. Report the conclusion of the trend analysis and provide a schedule for any new actions to be taken within the next 12 months. | With next annual pollution minimization program report due February 28 (at least 90 days following notification) |
| 3 | Report Status. Submit an annual report documenting copper control program implementation that evaluates the effectiveness of the actions taken, including any additional actions required by Task 2 above, and provides a schedule for actions to be taken within the next 12 months. | Annually, with annual pollution minimization program report due February 28 each year |

- 6.3.5.2. **Cyanide Action Plan.** The Discharger shall implement monitoring and surveillance, source control, and pollution prevention for cyanide in accordance with the following tasks and time schedule:

Table 4. Cyanide Action Plan

| Task No. | Task | Deadline |
|----------|---|---|
| 1 | Review Potential Cyanide Sources. Submit an up-to-date inventory of potential cyanide sources. If no cyanide source is identified, Tasks 2 and 3, below, are not required unless the Discharger receives a request to discharge detectable levels of cyanide to the sewer. In such case, notify the Executive Officer and implement Tasks 2 and 3. | With annual pollution minimization program report due February 28, 2023 |
| 2 | Implement Cyanide Control Program. Implement a control program to minimize cyanide discharges consisting, at a minimum, of the following elements: a. Inspect each potential source to assess the need to include that source in the control program. b. Inspect sources included in the control program annually. Inspection elements may be based on U.S. EPA guidance, such as <i>Industrial User Inspection and Sampling Manual for POTWs</i> (EPA 831 B 94 01). c. Develop and distribute educational materials regarding the need to prevent cyanide discharges to sources included in the control program. | Implementation shall be ongoing following Executive Officer notification under Task 1 |

| Task No. | Task | Deadline |
|----------|--|--|
| | d. Prepare an emergency monitoring and response plan to be implemented if a significant cyanide discharge occurs. If the plant influent cyanide concentration exceeds 18 µg/L, the Discharger shall collect a follow-up sample within 5 days of becoming aware of the laboratory results. If the results of the follow-up sample also exceed 18 µg/L, then a "significant cyanide discharge" is occurring. | |
| 3 | Implement Additional Measures. If the Regional Water Board notifies the Discharger that ambient monitoring shows cyanide concentrations are 1.0 µg/L or higher in the main body of San Francisco Bay, then within 90 days of the notification, commence actions to identify and abate cyanide sources responsible for the elevated ambient concentrations, report on the progress and effectiveness of the actions taken, and provide a schedule for actions to be taken within the next 12 months. | With next annual pollution minimization program report due February 28 (at least 90 days following notification) |
| 4 | Report Status of Cyanide Control Program. Submit an annual report documenting cyanide control program implementation and addressing the effectiveness of actions taken, including any additional cyanide controls required by Task 3, above, and provide a schedule for actions to be taken within the next 12 months. | Annually, with annual pollution minimization program report due February 28 each year |

6.3.4.3. **Anaerobically-Digestible Material.** If the Discharger receives hauled-in anaerobically-digestible material for injection into an anaerobic digester, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board and develop and implement Standard Operating Procedures for this activity. The Standard Operating Procedures shall be developed prior to initiation of hauling. The Standard Operating Procedures shall address material handling, including unloading, screening, or other processing prior to anaerobic digestion; transportation; spill prevention; spill response; avoidance of the introduction of materials that could cause interference, pass through, or upset of the treatment processes; avoidance of prohibited material; vector control; odor control; operation and maintenance; and the disposition of any solid waste segregated from introduction to the digester. The Discharger shall train its staff on the Standard Operating Procedures and maintain records for a minimum of three years for each load received, describing the hauler, waste type, and quantity received. In addition, the Discharger shall maintain records for a minimum of three years for the disposition, location, and quantity of cumulative pre-digestion segregated solid waste hauled offsite.

6.3.5.4. **Average Annual Selenium Load.** The Discharger shall report the average annual selenium load with its application for permit reissuance. The average annual load shall be the arithmetic mean of the annual mass discharges for

the previous permit term. Annual mass emissions shall be computed as follows:

$$\text{Annual Mass emission rate (kg/day)} = (3.785/N) \sum Q_i C_i$$

where:

N = number of samples in a year

Q_i = flow rate (MGD) associated with the i^{th} sample, valid until a new sample is collected

C_i = selenium concentration (mg/L) associated with the i^{th} sample, valid until a new sample is collected

When calculating selenium loads, the Discharger shall use estimated values and assume data reported below the method detection limit equal half of the detection limit.

ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

DEFINITIONS

Alternative Hypothesis

Statement used to propose a statistically significant relationship in a set of given observations. Under the TST approach, when the Null Hypothesis is rejected, the Alternative Hypothesis is accepted in its place, indicating a relationship between variables and an acceptable level of toxicity.

Arithmetic Mean (μ)

Also called the average, sum of measured values divided by the number of samples. For ambient water concentrations, the arithmetic mean is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Arithmetic mean} = \mu = \Sigma x / n$$

where: Σx is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations,
and n is the number of samples

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

Highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

Highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar week (Sunday through Saturday), calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar week divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that week.

Bioaccumulative

Taken up by an organism from its surrounding medium through gill membranes, through epithelial tissue, or from food and subsequently concentrated and retained in the body of the organism.

Calendar Month(s)

Period from the first day of a month through the last day of a month (e.g., January 1 to January 31). For toxicity monitoring, the period is from the first day of a routine monitoring test to the day before the corresponding day of the next month (e.g., from June 15 to July 14), or to the last day of the next month if there is no corresponding day (e.g., January 31 to February 28).

Carcinogenic

Known to cause cancer in living organisms.

Coefficient of Variation (CV)

Measure of data variability calculated as the estimated standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean of the observed values.

Daily Discharge

Either: (1) the total mass of a constituent discharged over a calendar day (12:00 a.m. through 11:59 p.m.) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling (as specified in the permit) for a constituent with limitations expressed in units of mass; or (2) the unweighted arithmetic mean measurement of a constituent over a day for a constituent with limitations expressed in other units of measurement (e.g., concentration).

The daily discharge may be determined by the analytical results of a composite sample taken over the course of one day (a calendar day or other 24-hour period defined as a day) or by the arithmetic mean of analytical results from one or more grab samples taken over the course of the day.

For composite sampling, if 1 day is defined as a 24-hour period other than a calendar day, the analytical result for the 24-hour period is considered the result for the calendar day in which the 24-hour period ends.

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

Sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL. Sample results reported as DNQ are estimated concentrations.

Dilution Credit

Amount of dilution granted to a discharge in the calculation of a water quality-based effluent limitation, based on the allowance of a specified mixing zone. It is calculated from the dilution ratio or determined through conducting a mixing zone study or modeling of the discharge and receiving water.

Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)

Value derived from the water quality criterion or objective, dilution credit, and ambient background concentration that is used, in conjunction with the CV for the effluent monitoring data, to calculate a long-term average (LTA) discharge concentration. The ECA has the same meaning as wasteload allocation (WLA) as used in U.S. EPA guidance (*Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, March 1991, second printing, EPA/505/2-90-001).

Effective Concentration (EC)

The EC is a point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause an adverse effect on a quantal, "all or nothing," response (such as death, immobilization, or serious incapacitation) in a given percent of the test organisms. If the effect is death or immobility, the term lethal concentration (LC) may be used. EC values may be calculated using point estimation techniques such as probit, logit, and Spearman-Kärber. EC25 is the concentration of toxicant (in percent effluent) that causes a response in 25 percent of the test organisms.

Enclosed Bays

Indentations along the coast that enclose an area of oceanic water within distinct headlands or harbor works. Enclosed bays include all bays where the narrowest

distance between the headlands or outermost harbor works is less than 75 percent of the greatest dimension of the enclosed portion of the bay. Enclosed bays include, but are not limited to, Humboldt Bay, Bodega Harbor, Tomales Bay, Drake's Estero, San Francisco Bay, Morro Bay, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Upper and Lower Newport Bay, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay. Enclosed bays do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

Estimated Chemical Concentration

Concentration that results from the confirmed detection of a substance below the ML by the analytical method.

Estuaries

Waters, including coastal lagoons, located at the mouths of streams that serve as areas of mixing for fresh and ocean waters. Coastal lagoons and mouths of streams that are temporarily separated from the ocean by sandbars shall be considered estuaries. Estuarine waters are considered to extend from a bay or the open ocean to a point upstream where there is no significant mixing of fresh water and seawater. Estuarine waters included, but are not limited to, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, as defined in Water Code section 12220; Suisun Bay; Carquinez Strait downstream to the Carquinez Bridge; and appropriate areas of the Smith, Mad, Eel, Noyo, Russian, Klamath, San Diego, and Otay rivers. Estuaries do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

Inhibition Concentration (IC)

The IC is a point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause a given percent reduction in a nonlethal, nonquantal biological measurement, such as growth. For example, an IC25 is the estimated concentration of toxicant that would cause a 25 percent reduction in average young per female or growth. IC values may be calculated using a linear interpolation method such as U.S. EPA's Bootstrap Procedure.

Inland Surface Waters

All surface waters of the state that are not the ocean, enclosed bays, or estuaries.

Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation

Highest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous maximum limitation).

Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation

Lowest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous minimum limitation).

Instream Waste Concentration (IWC)

Concentration of effluent in the receiving water after any dilution credit is applied. The IWC is the inverse of 1 plus the dilution credit, D, or $IWC = 1/(1+D)$, expressed as a percentage (e.g., if D = 9, the IWC is 10 percent). If no dilution credit is granted, the IWC is 100 percent.

Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

Highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For toxicity, the MDEL is based on the outcome of the TST and the percent effect at the IWC (applied to the results of any single bioassay). For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.

Maximum Daily Effluent Target (MDET)

Target based on a single independent toxicity test using the TST used to determine whether a TRE should be conducted. Not meeting the MDET is not a violation of an effluent limitation. The MDET only applies to discharges with no numeric toxicity limits.

Median

Middle measurement in a data set. The median of a data set is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of measurements (n) is odd, then the median = $X_{(n+1)/2}$. If n is even, then the median = $(X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2+1)})/2$ (i.e., the midpoint between $n/2$ and $n/2+1$).

Median Monthly Effluent Limitation (MMEL)

Highest allowable median of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the median of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month. For aquatic toxicity, the MMEL is an effluent limitation based on a maximum of three independent toxicity tests analyzed using the TST during a calendar month.

Median Monthly Effluent Target (MMET)

Target based on a maximum of three independent toxicity tests using the TST during a calendar month used to determine whether a TRE should be conducted. Not meeting a MMET is not a violation of an effluent limitation.

Method Detection Limit (MDL)

Minimum concentration of a substance that can be reported with 99 percent confidence that the measured concentration is distinguishable from method blank results, as defined in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Appendix B.

Minimum Level (ML)

Concentration at which the entire analytical system must give a recognizable signal and acceptable calibration point. The ML is the concentration in a sample that is equivalent to the concentration of the lowest calibration standard analyzed by a specific analytical procedure, assuming that all the method specified sample weights, volumes, and processing steps have been followed.

Mixing Zone

Limited volume of receiving water allocated for mixing with a wastewater discharge where water quality criteria can be exceeded without causing adverse effects to the overall water body.

MMEL Compliance Test

For chronic toxicity monitoring, one of up to two tests used in addition to a routine monitoring test to determine compliance with the chronic toxicity MMEL and MDEL.

MMET Test

For chronic toxicity monitoring, one of up to two tests used in addition to a routine monitoring test to evaluate if the discharge meets the chronic toxicity MMET and MDET.

No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC)

The NOEC is the highest tested concentration of an effluent or a toxicant at which no adverse effects are observed on the aquatic test organisms at a specific time of observation. It is determined using hypothesis testing.

No Observed Effect level (NOEL)

For compliance determination, the NOEL is equal to IC25 or EC25. If the IC25 or EC25 cannot be statistically determined, the NOEL shall be equal to the NOEC derived using hypothesis testing.

Not Detected (ND)

Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL.

Null Hypothesis

Statement used in statistical testing that has been put forward either because it is believed to be true or because it is to be used as a basis for argument, but has not been proved.

Percent Effect

Value that denotes the difference in response between a test concentration and a control, divided by the mean control response and multiplied by 100.

Persistent Pollutants

Substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

Pollutant Minimization Program

Program of waste minimization and pollution prevention actions that include, but are not limited to, product substitution, waste stream recycling, alternative waste management methods, and education of the public and businesses. The goal of a Pollutant Minimization Program is to reduce all potential sources of a priority pollutant through pollutant minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures as appropriate, to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the water quality-based effluent limitation. Pollution prevention measures may be particularly appropriate for persistent bioaccumulative priority pollutants where there is evidence that beneficial uses are being impacted. Cost effectiveness may be considered when establishing the requirements of a Pollutant Minimization Program. The completion and implementation of a Pollution Prevention Plan, if required pursuant to Water Code section 13263.3(d), is considered to fulfill the Pollutant Minimization Program requirements.

Pollution Prevention

Any action that causes a net reduction in the use or generation of a hazardous substance or other pollutant discharged into water and includes, but is not limited to, input change, operational improvement, production process change, and product reformulation (as defined in Water Code section 13263.3). Pollution prevention does not include actions that merely shift a pollutant in wastewater from one environmental medium to another environmental medium, unless clear environmental benefits of such an approach are identified to the satisfaction of the State Water Resources Control Board or Regional Water Board.

Regulatory Management Decision (RMD)

Decision that represents the maximum allowable error rates and thresholds for toxicity and non-toxicity that would result in an acceptable risk to aquatic life.

Reporting Level (RL)

ML (and its associated analytical method) chosen by the Discharger for reporting and compliance determination from the MLs included in this Order, including an additional factor if applicable as discussed herein. For priority pollutants, the MLs included in this Order correspond to approved analytical methods for reporting a sample result that are selected by the Regional Water Board either from State Implementation Plan (SIP) Appendix 4 in accordance with SIP section 2.4.2 or established in accordance with SIP section 2.4.3. The ML is based on the proper application of method-based analytical procedures for sample preparation and the absence of any matrix interferences. Other factors may be applied to the ML depending on the specific sample preparation steps employed. For example, the treatment typically applied in cases where there are matrix-effects is to dilute the sample or sample aliquot by a factor of ten. In such cases, this additional factor must be applied to the ML in the computation of the RL.

Response

Measured biological effect (e.g., on survival, reproduction, growth) of exposure to a stimulus.

Routine Monitoring

Regular chronic toxicity monitoring required during the permit term. Routine monitoring results may trigger MMEL compliance tests or MMET tests. If a violation of the MDEL or MMEL occurs, or if the discharge does not meet the MDET or MMET, routine monitoring also includes one sample collected during the following month (regardless of the regular monitoring frequency), which is used to determine if a TRE is necessary. Routine monitoring does not include surveillance monitoring.

Source of Drinking Water

Any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) beneficial use.

Standard Deviation (σ)

Measure of variability calculated as follows:

$$\text{Standard deviation} = \sigma = (\sum[(x - \mu)^2]/(n - 1))^{0.5}$$

where: x is the observed value
 μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values
 n is the number of samples

Surveillance Monitoring

Chronic toxicity monitoring performed using the most sensitive species at an effluent concentration at least double the IWC. Surveillance monitoring results are not for assessing compliance with the chronic toxicity MMEL or MDEL.

Test of Significant Toxicity (TST)

Statistical approach used to analyze aquatic toxicity test data, as described in section IV.B.1.c of State Water Board's *State Policy for Water Quality Control: Toxicity Provisions*.

Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

Study conducted in a step-wise process designed to identify the causative agents of effluent or ambient toxicity, isolate the sources of toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of toxicity control options, and then confirm the reduction in toxicity. The first steps of the TRE consist of the collection of data relevant to the toxicity, including additional toxicity testing, and an evaluation of facility operations and maintenance practices, and best management practices. A Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) may be required as part of the TRE, if appropriate. A TIE is a set of procedures to identify the specific chemicals responsible for toxicity. These procedures are performed in three phases (characterization, identification, and confirmation) using aquatic organism toxicity tests.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|
| °F | degrees Fahrenheit |
| °C | degrees Celsius |
| % | Percent |
| µg/L | Micrograms per liter |
| µS/cm | Microsiemens per centimeter |
| 1/Blending Event | Once per blending event |
| 1/Discharge | Once per discharge |
| 1/Day | Once per day |
| 1/Month | Once per month |
| 1/Quarter | Once per quarter |
| 1/Week | Once per week |
| 1/Year | Once per year |
| 2/Month | Two times per month |
| 2/Week | Twice per week |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| 2/Year | Twice per year |
| 3/Week | Three times per week |
| 4/Week | Four times per week |
| 5/Week | Five times per week |
| AMEL | Average monthly effluent limitation |
| AWEL | Average weekly effluent limitation |
| B | Background concentration |
| C | Water quality criterion or objective |
| C-24 | 24-hour composite |
| CFU/100 mL | Colony forming units per 100 milliliters |
| CIWQS | California Integrated Water Quality System |
| Continuous | Measured continuously |
| Continuous/D | Measured continuously, and recorded and reported daily |
| Continuous/H | Measured continuously, and recorded and reported hourly |
| CTR | California Toxics Rule |
| CV | Coefficient of Variation |
| DMR | Discharge Monitoring Report |
| DNQ | Detected, but not quantified |
| DL | Detection level |
| ECA | Effluent Concentration Allowance |
| Grab | Grab sample |
| IWC | Instream Waste Concentration |
| MDEL | Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation |
| MDET | Maximum Daily Effluent Target |
| MDL | Method detection limit |
| MEC | Maximum effluent concentration |
| MG | Million gallons |
| mg/L | Milligrams per liter |
| mg/L as N | Milligrams per liter as nitrogen |
| MGD | Million gallons per day |
| ML | Minimum level |
| MMEL | Median Monthly Effluent Limitation |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| MMET | Median Monthly Effluent Target |
| MPN/100 mL | Most probable number per 100 milliliters |
| MRP | Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) |
| ND | Not detected |
| NTR | National Toxics Rule |
| NTU | Nephelometric turbidity units |
| ppt | Parts per thousand |
| RL | Reporting level |
| RPA | Reasonable potential analysis |
| SIP | <i>Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California</i> (State Implementation Policy) |
| SMR | Self-Monitoring Report |
| s.u. | Standard pH units |
| TIE | Toxicity identification evaluation |
| TRE | Toxicity reduction evaluation |
| TST | Test of Significant Toxicity |
| TUa | Acute toxicity units |
| TUc | Chronic toxicity units |
| WDRs | Waste discharge requirements |
| WQBEL | Water quality-based effluent limitation |

ATTACHMENT B – MAPS


Figure B-1. Facility Location



Figure B-2. Facility Site Plan



ATTACHMENT C – PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM



PROCESS FLOW SCHEMATIC
RODEO SANITARY DISTRICT

80rsd0722f1-200477.ai

ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE | D-2 |
| 2. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION..... | D-5 |
| 3. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING | D-6 |
| 4. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS | D-6 |
| 5. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING | D-7 |
| 6. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT | D-12 |
| 7. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS..... | D-12 |

ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

1. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

1.1. Duty to Comply

- 1.1.1. The Discharger must comply with all of the terms, requirements, and conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action; permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a); Wat. Code, §§ 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 13001, 13304, 13350, 13385.)
- 1.1.2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under CWA section 307(a) for toxic pollutants within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1).)

- 1.2. **Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense.** It shall not be a defense for a Discharger in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c).)

- 1.3. **Duty to Mitigate.** The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of this Order that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d).)

- 1.4. **Proper Operation and Maintenance.** The Discharger shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) that are installed or used by the Discharger to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems that are installed by a Discharger only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e).)

1.5. Property Rights

- 1.5.1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g).)
- 1.5.2. The issuance of this Order does not authorize any injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations. (40 C.F.R. § 122.5(c).)

1.6. Inspection and Entry. The Discharger shall allow the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383):

- 1.6.1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(i); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
- 1.6.2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
- 1.6.3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383); and
- 1.6.4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of ensuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

1.7. Bypass

1.7.1. Definitions

- 1.7.1.1. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i).)
- 1.7.1.2. "Severe property damage" means substantial physical damage to property; damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable; or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii).)
- 1.7.2. **Bypass not exceeding limitations.** The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur that does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to ensure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance sections 1.7.3, 1.7.4, and 1.7.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2).)

- 1.7.3. **Prohibition of bypass.** Bypass is prohibited, and the Regional Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):
- 1.7.3.1. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));
- 1.7.3.2. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
- 1.7.3.3. The Discharger submitted notice to the Regional Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance section 1.7.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)
- 1.7.4. **Approval.** The Regional Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Regional Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance section 1.7.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)
- 1.7.5. **Notice**
- 1.7.5.1. **Anticipated bypass.** If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit prior notice, if possible, at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. The notice shall be sent to the Regional Water Board. As of December 21, 2025, a notice shall also be submitted electronically to the initial recipient defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.10 below. Notices shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, 40 C.F.R. section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)
- 1.7.5.2. **Unanticipated bypass.** The Discharger shall submit a notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.5 below (24-hour notice). The notice shall be sent to the Regional Water Board. As of December 21, 2025, a notice shall also be submitted electronically to the initial recipient defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.10 below. Notices shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, 40 C.F.R. section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)
- 1.8. **Upset.** Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology-based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error,

improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(1).)

- 1.8.1. **Effect of an upset.** An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology-based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance section 1.8.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).)
- 1.8.2. **Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset.** A Discharger who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):
 - 1.8.2.1. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));
 - 1.8.2.2. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));
 - 1.8.2.3. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.5.2.2 below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
 - 1.8.2.4. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance section 1.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv).)
- 1.8.3. **Burden of proof.** In any enforcement proceeding, the Discharger seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(4).)

2. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION

- 2.1. **General.** This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Discharger for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any Order condition. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(f).)
- 2.2. **Duty to Reapply.** If the Discharger wishes to continue an activity regulated by this Order after the expiration date of this Order, the Discharger must apply for and obtain a new permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b).)

2.3. Transfers. This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Regional Water Board. The Regional Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and Water Code. (40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41(l)(3), 122.61.)

3. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

- 3.1.** Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1).)
- 3.2.** Monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N. Monitoring must be conducted according to sufficiently sensitive test methods approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analysis of pollutants or pollutant parameters or as required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N. For the purposes of this paragraph, a method is sufficiently sensitive when:
- 3.2.1.** The method minimum level (ML) is at or below the level of the most stringent effluent limitation established in the permit for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, and either the method ML is at or below the level of the most stringent applicable water quality criterion for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter or the method ML is above the applicable water quality criterion but the amount of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the facility's discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the discharge; or
- 3.2.2.** The method has the lowest ML of the analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N, for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter.

In the case of pollutants or pollutant parameters for which there are no approved methods under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or otherwise required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N, monitoring must be conducted according to a test procedure specified in this Order for such pollutants or pollutant parameters. (40 C.F.R. §§ 122.21(e)(3), 122.41(j)(4), 122.44(i)(1)(iv).)

4. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

- 4.1.** The Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report, or application. This period may be extended by request of the Regional Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2).)

4.2. Records of monitoring information shall include:

- 4.2.1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(i));
- 4.2.2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
- 4.2.3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
- 4.2.4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
- 4.2.5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
- 4.2.6. The results of such analyses. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)

4.3. Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)):

- 4.3.1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(1)); and
- 4.3.2. Permit applications and attachments, permits, and effluent data. (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(2).)

5. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

5.1. Duty to Provide Information. The Discharger shall furnish to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA within a reasonable time, any information that the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

5.2. Signatory and Certification Requirements

- 5.2.1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting sections 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5, and 5.2.6 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k).)
- 5.2.2. For a corporation, all permit applications shall be signed by a responsible corporate officer. For the purpose of this section, a responsible corporate officer means: (1) a president, secretary, treasurer, or vice-president of the corporation in charge of a principal business function, or any other person who performs similar policy- or decision-making functions for the corporation, or (2) the

manager of one or more manufacturing, production, or operating facilities, provided the manager is authorized to make management decisions that govern the operation of the regulated facility, including having the explicit or implicit duty of making major capital investment recommendations, and initiating and directing other comprehensive measures to ensure long term environmental compliance with environmental laws and regulations; the manager can ensure that the necessary systems are established or actions taken to gather complete and accurate information for permit application requirements; and where authority to sign documents has been assigned or delegated to the manager in accordance with corporate procedures. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(1).)

For a partnership or sole proprietorship, all permit applications shall be signed by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(2).)

For a municipal, state, federal, or other public agency, all permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes (1) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (2) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of U.S. EPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).)

- 5.2.3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.2.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
- 5.2.3.1. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.2.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
 - 5.2.3.2. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity, such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
 - 5.2.3.3. The written authorization is submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)
- 5.2.4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.2.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.2.3 above must be

submitted to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)

- 5.2.5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.2.2 or 5.2.3 above shall make the following certification:

“I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d).)

- 5.2.6. Any person providing the electronic signature for documents described in Standard Provisions – Reporting sections 5.2.1, 5.2.2, or 5.2.3 that are submitted electronically shall meet all relevant requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.2, and shall ensure that all relevant requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 3 (Cross-Media Electronic Reporting) and 40 C.F.R. part 127 (NPDES Electronic Reporting Requirements) are met for that submission. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(e).)

5.3. Monitoring Reports

- 5.3.1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4).)
- 5.3.2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board. All reports and forms must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.10 and comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, 40 C.F.R. section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
- 5.3.3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or reporting form specified by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii).)

- 5.3.4. Calculations for all limitations that require averaging of measurements shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii).)

5.4. Compliance Schedules. Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this Order shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(5).)

5.5. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

- 5.5.1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A written report shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The report shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and, if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance.

For noncompliance related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports must include the data described above (with the exception of time of discovery) as well as the type of event (i.e., combined sewer overflow, sanitary sewer overflow, or bypass event), type of overflow structure (e.g., manhole, combined sewer overflow outfall), discharge volume untreated by the treatment works treating domestic sewage, types of human health and environmental impacts of the event, and whether the noncompliance was related to wet weather.

As of December 21, 2025, all reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events must be submitted to the Regional Water Board and must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting section 5.10. The reports shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, 40 C.F.R. section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. The Regional Water Board may also require the Discharger to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)

- 5.5.2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours:
- 5.5.2.1. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
- 5.5.2.2. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)

5.5.3. The Regional Water Board may waive the above required written report on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)

5.6. Planned Changes. The Discharger shall give notice to the Regional Water Board as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required under this provision only when (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)):

5.6.1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in 40 C.F.R. section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or

5.6.2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this Order unless the discharge is an existing manufacturing, commercial, mining, or silvicultural discharge as referenced in 40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii).) If the discharge is an existing manufacturing, commercial, mining, or silvicultural discharge as referenced in 40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a), this notification applies to pollutants that are subject neither to effluent limitations in this Order nor to notification requirements under 40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(1) (see Additional Provisions – Notification Levels section 7.1.1). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii).)

5.7. Anticipated Noncompliance. The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Regional Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(2).)

5.8. Other Noncompliance. The Discharger shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Standard Provisions – Reporting sections 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 above at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Standard Provision – Reporting section 5.5 above. For noncompliance related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports shall contain the information described in Standard Provision – Reporting section 5.5 and the applicable required data in appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 127. The Regional Water Board may also require the Discharger to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(7).)

5.9. Other Information. When the Discharger becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8).)

5.10. Initial Recipient for Electronic Reporting Data. The owner, operator, or duly authorized representative is required to electronically submit NPDES information specified in appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 127 to the initial recipient defined in 40 C.F.R. § 7.2(b). U.S. EPA will identify and publish the list of initial recipients on its website and in the Federal Register, by state and by NPDES data group [see 40 C.F.R. § 127.2(c)]. U.S. EPA will update and maintain this list. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(9).)

6. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

6.1. The Regional Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, Water Code sections 13268, 13385, 13386, and 13387.

7. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

7.1. Non-Municipal Facilities. Existing manufacturing, commercial, mining, and silvicultural Dischargers shall notify the Regional Water Board as soon as they know or have reason to believe (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)):

7.1.1. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in the discharge, on a routine or frequent basis, of any toxic pollutant that is not limited in this Order, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following “notification levels” (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)):

7.1.1.1. 100 micrograms per liter (µg/L) (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(i));

7.1.1.2. 200 µg/L for acrolein and acrylonitrile; 500 µg/L for 2,4 dinitrophenol and 2-methyl 4,6 dinitrophenol; and 1 milligram per liter (mg/L) for antimony (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(ii));

7.1.1.3. Five (5) times the maximum concentration reported for that pollutant in the Report of Waste Discharge (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(iii)); or

7.1.1.4. The level established by the Regional Water Board in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(f). (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)(iv).)

7.1.2. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in the discharge, on a non-routine or infrequent basis, of any toxic pollutant that is not limited in this Order, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following “notification levels” (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)):

7.1.2.1. 500 micrograms per liter (µg/L) (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(i));

7.1.2.2. 1 milligram per liter (mg/L) for antimony (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(ii));

7.1.2.3. Ten (10) times the maximum concentration reported for that pollutant in the Report of Waste Discharge (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(iii)); or

- 7.1.2.4. The level established by the Regional Water Board in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(f). (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(iv).)

7.2 Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)

- 7.2.1. All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Regional Water Board of any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to CWA sections 301 or 306 if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)).
- 7.2.2. All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Regional Water Board of any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2).)
- 7.2.3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3).)

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS | E-2 |
| 2. MONITORING LOCATIONS | E-3 |
| 3. INFLUENT MONITORING | E-3 |
| 4. EFFLUENT MONITORING | E-4 |
| 5. TOXICITY MONITORING | E-5 |
| 6. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING | E-16 |
| 7. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS | E-16 |

TABLES

| | |
|--|-------------|
| TABLE E-1. MONITORING LOCATIONS | E-3 |
| TABLE E-2. INFLUENT MONITORING | E-3 |
| TABLE E-3. EFFLUENT MONITORING | E-4 |
| TABLE E-4. TOXICITY REDUCTION EVALUATION (TRE) TRIGGERS | E-15 |
| TABLE E-5. CIWQS REPORTING | E-17 |
| TABLE E-6. MONITORING PERIODS | E-17 |

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Clean Water Act (CWA) section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code section 13383 also authorizes the Regional Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. This MRP establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement the federal and State laws and regulations.

1. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

- 1.1. The Discharger shall comply with this MRP. The Executive Officer may amend this MRP pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 122.63. If any discrepancies exist between this MRP and the “Regional Standard Provisions, and Monitoring and Reporting Requirements (Supplement to Attachment D) for NPDES Wastewater Discharge Permits” (Attachment G), this MRP shall prevail.
- 1.2. The Discharger shall conduct all monitoring in accordance with Attachment D section 3, as supplemented by Attachment G. Equivalent test methods must be more sensitive than those specified in 40 C.F.R. section 136 and must be specified in this permit.
- 1.3. For the analysis of monitoring samples, the Discharger shall use laboratories certified by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) in accordance with Water Code section 13176 and shall obtain quality assurance/quality control data with laboratory reports. For any onsite field tests (e.g., turbidity, pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, disinfectant residual) analyzed by a noncertified laboratory, the Discharger shall implement a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program. The Discharger shall keep a manual onsite containing the steps followed in this program and shall demonstrate sufficient capability to adequately perform these field tests (e.g., qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments). The program shall conform to U.S. EPA guidelines or other approved procedures.
- 1.4. The Discharger shall ensure that the results of the Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study or most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Board at the following address:

State Water Resources Control Board;
Quality Assurance Program Officer;
Office of Information Management and Analysis;
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

2. MONITORING LOCATIONS

The Discharger shall establish the following monitoring locations to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitations, discharge specifications, and other requirements of this Order:

Table E-1. Monitoring Locations

| Discharge Point | Monitoring Location | Monitoring Location Description |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Influent | INF-001 | A point in the treatment plant headworks where all waste tributary to the treatment system is present and preceding any phase of treatment |
| Effluent | EFF-001 | A point at the treatment plant effluent wet well downstream of the dechlorination point. This location may be the same as Monitoring Location EFF-001D |
| Effluent | EFF-001D | A point following dechlorination at which adequate contact with the disinfectant is ensured. This location may be the same as Monitoring Location EFF-001 |
| Biosolids | BIO-001 | Biosolids (treated sludge) |
| Toxicity Surveillance | SUR-001 | A point following all treatment at the plant prior to discharge to San Pablo Bay. This location may be the same as Monitoring Location EFF-001 |

3. INFLUENT MONITORING

The Discharger shall monitor treatment plant influent at Monitoring Location INF-001 as follows:

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring

| Parameter | Unit | Sample Type | Minimum Sampling Frequency |
|---|--------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Flow ^[1] | MG/MGD | Continuous | Continuous/D |
| Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand, 5-day @ 20°C (CBOD) | mg/L | C-24 | 1/Week |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | mg/L | C-24 | 1/Week |
| Cyanide ^[2] | µg/L | Grab | 2/Year |

Footnotes:

^[1] The following flow information shall be reported in quarterly self-monitoring reports:

- Daily average flow rate (MGD)
- Total monthly flow volume (MG)

^[2] The Discharger may, at its option, analyze for cyanide as weak acid dissociable cyanide using protocols specified in 40 C.F.R. part 136, or an equivalent method in the latest Standard Method edition.

4. EFFLUENT MONITORING

The Discharger shall monitor treatment plant effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 or EFF-001D as follows:

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

| Parameter | Unit | Sample Type | Minimum Sampling Frequency |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Flow ^[1] | MG/MGD | Continuous | Continuous/D |
| Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand, 5-day @ 20°C (CBOD) ^[2] | mg/L | C-24 | 1/Week |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) ^[2] | mg/L | C-24 | 1/Week |
| pH ^[3] | standard units | Continuous or Grab | Continuous/D or 1/Day |
| Chlorine, Total Residual | mg/L | Continuous | Continuous/H ^{[4][5][6]} |
| Enterococcus Bacteria ^[7] | CFU/100mL ^[8] | Grab | 3/Week |
| Acute Toxicity ^[9] | % survival | Static Renewal | 1/Year |
| Chronic Toxicity (Prior to U.S. EPA Approval of Toxicity Provisions) ^[10] | TU _c ^[11] | C-24 | 2/Year |
| Chronic Toxicity (After U.S. EPA Approval of Toxicity Provisions) ^[12] | "pass" or "fail" and % effect ^[13] | C-24 | 2/Year |
| Ammonia, Total | mg/L | C-24 | 1/Month |
| Copper, Total Recoverable | µg/L | C-24 | 1/Month |
| Cyanide, Total ^[14] | µg/L | Grab | 1/Month |
| Chlorodibromomethane | µg/L | Grab | 2/Year |
| Selenium | µg/L | C-24 | Once |
| Dioxin-TEQ | µg/L | Grab | Once |
| Priority Pollutants ^[15] | µg/L | Grab (C-24 ^[16]) | Once |

Footnotes:

^[1] The following flow information shall be reported in quarterly self-monitoring reports:

- Daily average flow rate (MGD)
- Total monthly flow volume (MG)

^[2] CBOD₅ and TSS effluent samples shall be collected concurrently with CBOD and TSS influent samples. CBOD and TSS percent removal shall be reported for each calendar month (using the most recent sample results) in accordance with section 4.2 of this Order.

^[3] If pH is monitored continuously, the minimum and maximum for each day shall be reported in monthly self-monitoring reports. If continuous pH analyzer is unavailable, grab samples shall be daily.

^[4] Prior to U.S. EPA approval of Regional Water Board Resolution R2-2020-0031, effluent total residual chlorine concentrations shall be monitored continuously. The Discharger shall describe all excursions of the chlorine limit in the transmittal letter of self-monitoring reports as required by Attachment G section 5.3.1.1. If monitoring continuously, the Discharger shall report through data upload to CIWQS, from discrete readings of the continuous monitoring every hour on the hour, the maximum for each day and any other discrete hourly reading that exceed the effluent limit, and, for the purpose of mandatory minimum penalties required by Water Code section 13385(i), compliance shall be based only on these discrete readings. The Discharger shall retain continuous monitoring readings for at least three years. The Regional Water Board reserves the right to use all continuous monitoring data for discretionary enforcement.

If a continuous chlorine residual monitor malfunctions or is offline for essential maintenance, the Discharger shall substitute grab samples at a frequency of no less than one sample every hour 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.

^[5] On the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the chlorine water quality objectives set forth in Regional Water Board Resolution R2-2020-0031, total residual chlorine concentrations shall be monitored continuously and recorded at a frequency of not less than every 5 minutes. The minimum level for total residual chlorine analysis shall be no greater than

0.05 mg/L. To document compliance with the minimum level, the Discharger shall calibrate continuous total residual chlorine analyzers against grab samples as frequently as necessary to maintain accurate control and reliable operation.

If a continuous chlorine residual monitor malfunctions or is offline for essential maintenance lasting more than an hour, the Discharger shall substitute grab samples at a frequency of no less than one sample every hour 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.

To evaluate compliance with the one-hour average effluent limit, the Discharger 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 evaluation. The Discharger shall calculate arithmetic means for each hour using all the readings for that hour. The Discharger shall report through data upload to CIWQS the maximum one-hour arithmetic mean for each calendar day and any other arithmetic mean values that exceed the effluent limit. The Discharger shall retain documentation of chlorine results for at least three years.

- ^[6] The Discharger 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 exceedances are false positives, the exceedances shall not be violations of this Order's total residual chlorine effluent limits.
- ^[7] U.S. EPA Method 1600 or an equivalent method is suggested to measure culturable enterococci.
- ^[8] Results may be reported as either Most Probable Number (MPN)/100 mL if the laboratory method used provides results in MPN/100 mL or Colony Forming Units (CFU)/100 mL if the laboratory method used provides results in CFU/100 mL.
- ^[9] Acute bioassay tests shall be performed in accordance with MRP section 5.1. As of the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the State Water Board's State Policy for Water Quality Control: Toxicity Provisions (Toxicity Provisions), acute toxicity monitoring at Monitoring Location EFF-001 shall no longer be required.
- ^[10] Chronic toxicity tests shall be performed in accordance with MRP section 5.2 until the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, at which point MRP section 5.2 shall no longer apply and chronic toxicity tests shall be performed in accordance with MRP section 5.3.
- ^[11] Chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported in TUC until the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, at which point this requirement shall no longer apply.
- ^[12] Chronic toxicity tests shall be performed in accordance with MRP section 5.3 as of the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions.
- ^[13] Chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported in "pass" or "fail" and percent effect as of the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions.
- ^[14] The Discharger may, at its option, analyze for cyanide as weak acid dissociable cyanide using protocols specified in 40 C.F.R. part 136, or an equivalent method in the latest Standard Method edition.
- ^[15] The Discharger shall monitor for the pollutants listed in Attachment G, Table B.
- ^[16] The Discharger shall collect C-24 samples for metals.

5. TOXICITY MONITORING

5.1. Acute Toxicity (Prior to U.S. EPA Approval of Toxicity Provisions)

- 5.1.1. When required, compliance with the acute toxicity effluent limitations shall be evaluated at Monitoring Location EFF-001 by measuring survival of test organisms exposed to 96-hour static renewal bioassays.
- 5.1.2. Test organisms shall be fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*) or rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Alternatively, the Executive Officer may specify a more sensitive organism or, if testing a particular organism proves unworkable, the most sensitive organism available.
- 5.1.3. All bioassays shall be performed according to the most up-to-date protocols in 40 C.F.R. part 136, currently *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Water to Freshwater and Marine Organisms*, 5th Edition (EPA-821-R-02-012). If these protocols prove unworkable, the

Executive Officer and the Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program may grant exceptions in writing upon the Discharger's request with justification.

- 5.1.4. If the Discharger demonstrates that specific identifiable substances in the discharge are rapidly rendered harmless upon discharge to the receiving water, compliance with the acute toxicity limit may be determined after test samples are adjusted to remove the influence of those substances. Written acknowledgement that the Executive Officer concurs with the Discharger's demonstration and that the adjustment will not remove the influence of other substances must be obtained prior to any such adjustment. The Discharger is authorized to adjust the effluent pH in order to suppress the level of un-ionized (free) ammonia. This adjustment may be achieved by manually adjusting the pH of whole effluent toxicity samples prior to performing bioassays to minimize ammonia toxicity interference.
- 5.1.5. Effluent used for fish bioassays must be dechlorinated prior to testing. If biological growth in the dechlorinated effluent sample line is a potential problem, chlorinated effluent that is dechlorinated separately from the plant dechlorination process may be used for the bioassay test. The sample may be taken from final secondary effluent prior to disinfection. Bioassay monitoring shall include, on a daily basis, pH, dissolved oxygen, ammonia (if toxicity is observed), temperature, hardness, and alkalinity. These results shall be reported. If final or intermediate results of an acute bioassay test indicate a violation or threatened violation (e.g., the percentage of surviving test organisms is less than 70 percent), the Discharger shall initiate a new test as soon as practical and shall investigate the cause of the mortalities and report its findings in the next self-monitoring report. The Discharger shall repeat the test until a test fish survival rate of 90 percent or greater is observed. If the control fish survival rate is less than 90 percent, the bioassay test shall be restarted with new fish and shall continue as soon as practical until an acceptable test is completed (i.e., control fish survival rate is 90 percent or greater).

5.2. Chronic Toxicity (Prior to U.S. EPA Approval of Toxicity Provisions)

5.2.1. Monitoring Requirements

- 5.2.1.1. **Sampling.** The Discharger shall collect 24-hour composite effluent samples at Monitoring Location EFF-001 for critical life stage toxicity testing as indicated below. Effluent samples may be before disinfection for toxicity tests. For toxicity tests requiring renewals, the Discharger shall collect 24-hour composite samples on consecutive or alternating days.
- 5.2.1.2. **Test Species.** The test species shall be purple urchin (*Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*) or sand dollar (*Dendraster excentricus*). The Discharger shall conduct a screening chronic toxicity test as described in Appendix E-1, following any significant change in the nature of the effluent. If there is no significant change in the nature of the effluent, the Discharger shall conduct a

screening test if required by an applicable State Water Board plan and submit the results with its application for permit reissuance. Upon completion of the chronic toxicity screening, the Discharger shall use the most sensitive species to conduct subsequent monitoring.

5.2.1.3. **Frequency.** Chronic toxicity monitoring shall be as specified in Table E-3 above.

5.2.1.3.1. The Discharger shall accelerate monitoring to monthly after exceeding a single-sample maximum of 10 TUC. Based on the TUC results, the Executive Officer may specify a different accelerated monitoring frequency to ensure that accelerated monitoring provides useful information.

5.2.1.3.2. The Discharger shall return to routine monitoring if accelerated monitoring does not exceed the trigger in section 5.2.1.3.1, above.

5.2.1.3.3. If accelerated monitoring confirms consistent toxicity greater than the trigger in section 5.2.1.3.1, above, the Discharger shall continue accelerated monitoring and initiate toxicity reduction evaluation (TRE) procedures in accordance with section 5.2.3, below.

5.2.1.3.4. The Discharger shall return to routine monitoring after implementing appropriate elements of the TRE, and either the toxicity drops below the trigger in 5.2.1.3.1, above, or, based on the TRE results, the Executive Officer determines that accelerated monitoring would no longer provide useful information.

5.2.1.3.5. Monitoring conducted pursuant to a TRE shall satisfy the requirements for routine and accelerated monitoring while the TRE is underway.

5.2.1.4. **Methodology.** Sample collection, handling, and preservation shall be in accordance with U.S. EPA protocols. Bioassays shall be conducted in compliance with the most recently promulgated test methods, as shown in Appendix E-2. These are *Short Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms*, currently 1st edition (EPA/600/R-95-136), *Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Marine and Estuarine Organisms*, currently third edition (EPA-821-R-02-014) and *Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms*, currently fourth edition (EPA-821-R2-02-013). If these protocols prove unworkable, the Executive Officer and the Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program may grant exceptions in writing upon the Discharger's request with justification.

If the Discharger demonstrates that specific identifiable substances in the discharge are rapidly rendered harmless upon discharge to the receiving

water, compliance with the chronic toxicity limit may be determined after test samples are adjusted to remove the influence of those substances. The adjustment shall not remove the influence of other substances. Written acknowledgement that the Executive Officer concurs with the Discharger's demonstration must be obtained prior to any such adjustment.

5.2.1.5. **Dilution Series.** The Discharger shall conduct tests at 20%, 10%, 5%, 2.5%, 1.25%, and 0.625%. The "%" represents percent effluent as discharged. Test sample pH may be controlled to the level of the effluent sample as received prior to being salted up.

5.2.2. **Reporting Requirements.** The Discharger shall provide toxicity test results with self-monitoring reports and shall include the following, at a minimum, for each test:

5.2.2.1. Sample date;

5.2.2.2. Test initiation date;

5.2.2.3. Test species;

5.2.2.4. End point values for each dilution (e.g., number of young, growth rate, percent survival);

5.2.2.5. No Observable Effect Level (NOEL) values in percent effluent. The NOEL shall equal the IC25 or EC25 (see Attachment A). If the IC25 or EC25 cannot be statistically determined, the NOEL shall equal the No Observable Effect Concentration (NOEC) derived using hypothesis testing. The NOEC is the maximum percent effluent concentration that causes no observable effect on test organisms based on a critical life stage toxicity test;

5.2.2.6. IC15, IC25, IC40, and IC50 values (or EC15, EC25, EC40, and EC50) as percent effluent;

5.2.2.7. TUc values (100/NOEL and upper and lower confidence intervals, where NOEL = IC25, EC25, or NOEC);

5.2.2.8. Mean percent mortality (\pm standard deviation) after 96 hours in 100% effluent (if applicable);

5.2.2.9. IC25 or EC25 values for reference toxicant tests; and

5.2.2.10. Available water quality measurements for each test (e.g., pH, dissolved oxygen, temperature, conductivity, hardness, salinity, ammonia).

5.2.3. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

- 5.2.3.1. The Discharger shall prepare a generic TRE work plan within 90 days of the effective date of this Order to be ready to respond to toxicity events. The Discharger shall review and update the work plan as necessary so that it remains current and applicable to the discharge and discharge facilities.
- 5.2.3.2. Within 30 days of exceeding the chronic toxicity trigger in section 5.2.1.3.1, above, the Discharger shall submit a TRE work plan, which shall be the generic work plan revised as appropriate for this toxicity event after consideration of available discharge data.
- 5.2.3.3. Within 30 days of completing an accelerated monitoring test observed to exceed the trigger in section 5.2.1.3.1, above, the Discharger shall initiate a TRE in accordance with a TRE work plan that incorporates any and all Executive Officer comments.
- 5.2.3.4. The TRE shall be specific to the discharge and be in accordance with current technical guidance and reference materials, including U.S. EPA guidance materials. The Discharger shall conduct the TRE as a tiered evaluation as summarized below:
 - 5.2.3.4.1. Tier 1 shall consist of basic data collection (routine and accelerated monitoring).
 - 5.2.3.4.2. Tier 2 shall consist of evaluation of treatment process, including operational practices and in-plant process chemicals.
 - 5.2.3.4.3. Tier 3 shall consist of a toxicity identification evaluation (TIE).
 - 5.2.3.4.4. Tier 4 shall consist of a toxicity source evaluation.
 - 5.2.3.4.5. Tier 5 shall consist of a toxicity control evaluation, including options for modifications of in-plant treatment processes.
 - 5.2.3.4.6. Tier 6 shall consist of implementation of selected toxicity control measures, and follow-up monitoring and confirmation of implementation success.
- 5.2.3.5. The Discharger may end the TRE at any stage if monitoring finds there is no longer consistent toxicity (i.e., compliance with the trigger in section 5.2.1.3.1, above).
- 5.2.3.6. The objective of the TIE shall be to identify the substance or combination of substances causing the observed toxicity. The Discharger shall employ all reasonable efforts using currently available TIE methodologies.

- 5.2.3.7. As toxic substances are identified or characterized, the Discharger shall continue the TRE by determining the sources and evaluating alternative strategies for reducing or eliminating the toxic substances from the discharge. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to reduce toxicity to levels below the chronic toxicity trigger.
- 5.2.3.8. Many recommended TRE elements parallel required or recommended efforts related to source control, pollution prevention, and stormwater control programs. TRE efforts should be coordinated with such efforts. To prevent duplication of efforts, evidence of complying with requirements or recommended efforts of such programs may be acceptable to demonstrate compliance with TRE requirements.

5.3. Chronic Toxicity (After U.S. EPA Approval of Toxicity Provisions)

5.3.1. Instream Waste Concentration Monitoring

- 5.3.1.1. **Sampling.** The Discharger shall collect 24-hour composite effluent samples at Monitoring Location EFF-001 for critical life stage toxicity testing as indicated below. Effluent samples may be collected before disinfection for toxicity tests. For toxicity tests requiring renewals, the Discharger shall collect 24-hour composite samples on consecutive or alternating days.
- 5.3.1.2. **Test Species.** The test species shall be purple urchin (*Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*) or sand dollar (*Dendraster excentricus*) unless a more sensitive species is identified in accordance with MRP, Appendix E-1. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity species sensitivity screening as described in Appendix E-1. Upon completion of the chronic toxicity screening, the Executive Officer may specify the most sensitive species or, if testing a particular species proves unworkable (e.g., the Discharger encounters unresolvable test interference or cannot secure a reliable supply of test organisms), the most sensitive species available of those listed in MRP Tables AE-1 and AE-2. The Executive Officer will specify changes in test species in writing.
- 5.3.1.3. **Frequency.** The Discharger shall monitor chronic toxicity as specified below:
- 5.3.1.3.1. **Routine Monitoring.** The Discharger shall conduct routine monitoring twice per year at the Instream Waste Concentration (IWC) set forth in the MRP section 5.3.1.3.2 and continue routine monitoring during any Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE).
- 5.3.1.3.2. **Effluent Targets.** As of the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, the discharge at Discharge Point 001 shall meet the following maximum daily effluent target (MDET) and median monthly effluent target (MMET) at the IWC of 1.3 percent effluent

using the most sensitive species for effluent from Monitoring Location EFF-001:

- MDET: No test result of “fail” and no percent effect greater than or equal to 50 percent for any sub-lethal endpoint.
- MMET: No more than one result of “fail” in a calendar month for any endpoint.

If the discharge does not meet the MDET or MMET during a calendar month, the Discharger shall perform additional routine monitoring in accordance with the MRP section 5.3.1.3.3 and 5.3.1.3.4 to determine whether a TRE is required. The MDET and MMET are not effluent limitations.

5.3.1.3.3. **Additional Routine Monitoring Tests for TRE Determination.** If the Discharger does not meet the MDET or MMET during a calendar month and is not already conducting a TRE, the Discharger shall conduct an additional routine monitoring test during the following calendar month. This additional routine monitoring test shall be used to determine if a TRE is necessary according to the process shown in Appendix E-3. If there is not enough effluent available to test in the following calendar month, the Discharger shall return to twice per year routine monitoring as soon as enough effluent is available. The Executive Officer may also require the Discharger to conduct a TRE.

5.3.1.3.4. **MMET Tests and TRE Determination.** If any routine monitoring test result is “fail,” the Discharger shall conduct at least one and at most two MMET tests. The results of these tests shall be used to determine if a TRE is necessary according to the process shown in Appendix E-3. The Discharger shall initiate these tests within the same calendar month as the failed routine monitoring test. (For the purposes of MMET tests, the “calendar month” shall begin on the calendar day that the failed routine monitoring test was initiated. The “calendar month” shall end on the day before the corresponding day of the following month, or on the last day of the following month if it has no corresponding day [e.g., January 31 through February 28]).

5.3.1.3.4.1. If the first MMET test result is “pass,” then the Discharger shall conduct a second MMET test. If the first MMET test result is “fail,” that result does not meet the MMET and a second MMET test is not required. If any of the failed tests also did not meet the MDET, the Discharger shall conduct a TRE (see MRP § 5.3.3).

- 5.3.1.3.4.2. If the second MMET test result is “pass,” then the Discharger shall return to routine monitoring as described in MRP section 5.3.1.3.1.¹ If the second MMET test result is “fail,” that result does not meet the MMET. If any of the failed tests were also an MDET exceedance, the Discharger shall conduct a TRE (see MRP § 5.3.3).
- 5.3.1.3.4.3. If the Discharger cannot conduct an MMET test because not enough effluent is available to test, the Discharger shall return to routine monitoring as soon as enough effluent is available.
- 5.3.1.4. **Methodology.** Sample collection, handling, and preservation shall be in accordance with U.S. EPA protocols. Bioassays shall be conducted in compliance with the most recently promulgated test methods, as shown in Appendix E-2. These are *Short Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms*, currently 1st edition (EPA/600/R-95-136); *Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Marine and Estuarine Organisms*, currently 3rd edition (EPA-821-R-02-014); and *Short-Term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms*, currently 4th edition (EPA-821-R2-02-013). If these protocols prove unworkable, the Executive Officer and the Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program may grant exceptions in writing upon the Discharger’s request with justification.

Chronic toxicity shall be evaluated using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) as described in the State Water Board’s *State Policy for Water Quality Control: Toxicity Provisions* (Toxicity Provisions), section III.B.3. The selected test concentrations shall include the IWC. The TST shall be conducted using the IWC sample and a control as described in Toxicity Provisions section III.B.3. Test sample pH may be controlled to the level of the effluent sample as received by the laboratory prior to being salted up. A result of “fail” indicates toxicity at the IWC.

If the Discharger demonstrates that specific identifiable substances in the discharge are rapidly rendered harmless upon discharge to the receiving water, the evaluation for meeting the chronic toxicity target may be performed after test samples are adjusted to remove the influence of those substances. The adjustment shall not remove the influence of other substances. Written acknowledgement that the Executive Officer concurs

¹ See Appendix E-3, Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Process Flowchart.

with the Discharger's demonstration must be obtained prior to any such adjustment.

5.3.2. Reporting

The Discharger shall provide toxicity test results with self-monitoring reports and shall include the following, at a minimum, for each test:

- 5.3.2.1. Sample date
- 5.3.2.2. Test initiation date
- 5.3.2.3. Test species
- 5.3.2.4. End point values for the control and IWC sample (e.g., number of young, growth rate, percent survival). For routine monitoring and MMET tests, the Discharger shall report the results as either "pass" or "fail," and the percent effect at the IWC for each endpoint. For surveillance monitoring (see MRP § 5.4), the Discharger shall report the results as either "pass" or "fail" and the percent effect at 10 percent effluent for each endpoint.
- 5.3.2.5. End point values for each replicate of the control and IWC sample (e.g., number of young, growth rate, percent survival).
- 5.3.2.6. Available water quality measurements for each test (e.g., pH, dissolved oxygen, temperature, conductivity, hardness, salinity, ammonia).

5.3.3. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

- 5.3.3.1. The Discharger shall prepare a generic TRE work plan within 90 days of the effective date of this Order to be ready to respond to toxicity events. The Discharger shall review and update the generic work plan as necessary so it remains current and applicable to the discharge and discharge facilities.
- 5.3.3.2. Within 30 days of the following circumstances, the Discharger shall submit a TRE work plan that shall be the generic work plan revised as appropriate for the particular toxicity observed. The circumstances triggering a TRE are as follows:
 - 5.3.3.2.1. The Discharger does not meet any combination of two or more MDETs or MMETs within a single calendar month or two successive calendar months;
 - 5.3.3.2.2. The Discharger does not meet the MDET or MMET during a calendar month, there is no effluent available to test in the following calendar month, and Executive Officer requires a TRE; or

- 5.3.3.2.3. Surveillance monitoring (as described in MRP § 5.3.4, below) results are “fail” for two consecutive surveillance tests.
- 5.3.3.3. Within 30 days of submitting the TRE work plan, the Discharger shall initiate a TRE in accordance with the TRE work plan. The TRE shall be specific to the discharge and be in accordance with current technical guidance and reference materials, including U.S. EPA guidance materials. The Discharger shall conduct the TRE as a tiered evaluation as summarized below:
 - 5.3.3.3.1. Tier 1 shall consist of basic data collection (routine monitoring, additional routine monitoring, and MMET tests);
 - 5.3.3.3.2. Tier 2 shall consist of evaluating treatment processes, including operational practices and process chemicals;
 - 5.3.3.3.3. Tier 3 shall consist of a toxicity identification evaluation (TIE) to identify the substance or combination of substances causing the observed toxicity. The Discharger shall employ all reasonable efforts using currently available TIE methodologies;
 - 5.3.3.3.4. Tier 4 shall consist of a toxicity source evaluation;
 - 5.3.3.3.5. Tier 5 shall consist of a toxicity control evaluation that considers alternative strategies, including treatment process modifications, to reduce or eliminate the toxic substances from the discharge; and
 - 5.3.3.3.6. Tier 6 shall consist of implementing all reasonable toxicity control measures, and follow-up monitoring and confirmation of implementation success.
- 5.3.3.4. The Discharger may end the TRE at any stage if monitoring finds there is no longer consistent toxicity (i.e., two consecutive test results of “pass”).
- 5.3.3.5. The Executive Officer may authorize the Discharger to end a TRE if the Discharger documents that it has exhausted all reasonable efforts to identify the cause of the toxicity.
- 5.3.3.6. Many recommended TRE elements parallel required or recommended efforts related to source control, pollution prevention, and stormwater control programs. TRE efforts should be coordinated with such efforts. To prevent duplication of efforts, evidence of complying with requirements or recommended efforts of such programs may be acceptable to demonstrate compliance with TRE requirements.
- 5.3.3.7. The routine monitoring frequency shall be a minimum of two tests per calendar year at the IWC when the Discharger is conducting toxicity testing as part of a TRE during that calendar year. The Discharger must return to the

routine monitoring frequency specified in MRP section 5.3.1.3.1 at the conclusion of the TRE or one year after the initiation of the TRE, whichever occurs sooner.

TRE triggers are set forth in Table E-4 below.

Table E-4. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Triggers

| Monitoring Type and Frequency | Triggers | TRE Required? |
|--|--|--------------------|
| Routine and MMET monitoring, less than monthly frequency | 1. The MDET or MMET is not met in a calendar month, AND 2. No discharge during the following calendar month | EO may require TRE |
| Routine and MMET monitoring | Any combination of two or more MDETs or MMETs are not met in a single calendar month or successive calendar months | TRE is required |
| Surveillance monitoring | "Fail" result in two consecutive surveillance samples | TRE is required |

5.3.4. Surveillance Monitoring

The Discharge shall conduct surveillance monitoring and reporting as described below:

5.3.4.1. **Sampling.** The Discharger shall collect 24-hour composite effluent samples for surveillance monitoring at Monitoring Location SUR-001 as otherwise described in MRP section 5.3.1.1.

5.3.4.2. **Test Species.** The test species shall be the most sensitive species determined as required by MRP section 5.3.1.2.

5.3.4.3. **Surveillance Monitoring Frequency.** Surveillance monitoring shall be conducted twice per year. Surveillance monitoring tests may be conducted concurrently with routine monitoring. If a surveillance monitoring result is "fail," the Discharger shall conduct an additional surveillance monitoring test no later than the next calendar month in which there is sufficient effluent flow. If the result of the second test is "fail," the Discharger shall conduct a TRE.

Surveillance monitoring is not required during a TRE. The Discharger must return to surveillance monitoring at the conclusion of the TRE.

5.3.4.4. **Methodology.** Sample collection, handling, and preservation shall be as required by MRP section 5.3.1.4. Chronic toxicity shall be evaluated using

the TST, also as required by MRP section 5.3.1.4. The selected test concentrations shall include 10 percent effluent and a control. The TST shall be conducted using the 10 percent effluent sample and the control.

- 5.3.4.5. **Reporting.** The Discharger shall provide toxicity test results as required by MRP section 5.3.2.

6. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING

The Discharger shall continue to participate in the Regional Monitoring Program (RMP), which collects data on pollutants and toxicity in San Francisco Bay water, sediment, and biota. The Discharger shall also provide supplemental funding to the RMP to support additional studies for constituents of emerging concern. The Discharger shall, either individually or in collaboration with other dischargers, submit or cause to submit a report each year that indicates the status of its RMP payment. The report shall be due on the same day as the letters certifying the Discharger's annual payment in support of RMP receiving water monitoring (currently February 1 each year).

7. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- 7.1. **General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.** The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachments D and G) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.

7.2. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

- 7.2.1. **SMR Format.** The Discharger shall electronically submit SMRs using the State Water Board's [California Integrated Water Quality System \(CIWQS\) Program website](https://waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/) (waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs). The CIWQS website will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event of a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.
- 7.2.2. **SMR Due Dates and Contents.** The Discharger shall submit SMRs by the due dates, and with the contents, specified below:
- 7.2.2.1. **Monthly SMRs** — Monthly SMRs shall be due 30 days after the end of each calendar month, covering that calendar month. Each SMR shall contain the applicable items described in Provision 6.3.2 (Effluent Characterization Study and Report) of the Order, Attachment D section 5.2, and Attachment G section 5.3. Each SMR shall include all new monitoring results obtained since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the Discharger shall include the results of such monitoring in the calculations and reporting for the SMR.
- 7.2.2.2. **Annual SMR** — Annual SMRs shall be due February 1 each year, covering the previous calendar year. The annual SMR shall contain the applicable

items described in Provisions 6.3.2 (Effluent Characterization Study and Report) of the Order and Attachment G section 5.3.1.6.

- 7.2.3. **Specifications for Submitting SMRs to CIWQS.** The Discharger shall submit analytical results and other information using one of the following methods:

Table E-5. CIWQS Reporting

| Parameter | Method of Reporting: EDF/CDF data upload | Attached File |
|---|--|--|
| All parameters identified in influent, effluent, and receiving water monitoring tables (except Dissolved Oxygen and Temperature) | Required for all results | - |
| Dissolved Oxygen, Temperature | Required for monthly maximum and minimum results only ^[1] | Discharger may use this method for all results or keep records |
| Antimony, Arsenic, Beryllium, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Cyanide, Lead, Mercury, Nickel, Selenium, Silver, Thallium, Zinc, Dioxins & Furans (by U.S. EPA Method 1613), Other Pollutants (by U.S. EPA Methods 601, 602, 608, 610, 614, 624, and 625) | Required for all results ^[2] | - |
| Volume and Duration of Blended Discharge ^[3] | Required for all blended effluent discharges | - |
| Analytical Method | Not required (Discharger may select "data unavailable") ^[1] | - |
| Collection Time, Analysis Time | Not required | - |

Footnotes:

- ^[1] The Discharger shall continue to monitor at the minimum frequency specified in this MRP, keep records of the measurements, and make the records available upon request.
- ^[2] These parameters require EDF/CDF data upload or manual entry regardless of whether monitoring is required by this MRP or other provisions of this Order (except for biosolids, sludge, or ash provisions).
- ^[3] The requirement for volume and duration of blended discharge applies only if this Order authorizes the Discharger to discharge blended effluent.

The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format and summarize data to clearly illustrate whether the Facility is operating in compliance with effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.

- 7.2.4. **Monitoring Periods.** Monitoring periods for all required monitoring shall be as set forth below unless otherwise specified:

Table E-6. Monitoring Periods

| Sampling Frequency | Monitoring Period Begins On... | Monitoring Period |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Continuous/D | Order effective date | All times |

| Sampling Frequency | Monitoring Period Begins On... | Monitoring Period |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1/Hour | Order effective date | Every hour on the hour |
| 1/Day | Order effective date | Any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for sampling purposes (e.g., beginning at midnight and continuing through 11:59 p.m.) |
| 1/Week 2/Week 4/Week 5/Week | First Sunday following or on Order effective date | Sunday through Saturday |
| 1/Month | First day of calendar month following or on Order effective date ^[2] | First day of calendar month through last day of calendar month ^[2] |
| 1/Quarter | Closest January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1 before or after Order effective date ^[1] | January 1 through March 31 July 1 through September 30 April 1 through June 30 October 1 through December 31 |
| 1/Year | Closest January 1 before or after Order effective date ^[1] | January 1 through December 31 |
| 2/Year | Closest January 1 or July 1 before or after Order effective date ^[1] | January 1 through June 30 July 1 through December 31 |
| Once | Order effective date | Once during the term of the Order within 12 months prior to applying for permit reissuance |

Footnote:

^[1] Monitoring performed during the previous order term may be used to satisfy monitoring required by this Order.

^[2] See Attachment A for the definition of a calendar month for chronic toxicity testing.

7.2.5. RL and MDL Reporting. The Discharger shall report with each sample result the Reporting Level (RL) and Method Detection Limit (MDL) as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136. The Discharger shall report the results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample using the following reporting protocols:

- 7.2.5.1. Sample results greater than or equal to the RL shall be reported as measured by the laboratory (i.e., the measured chemical concentration in the sample).
- 7.2.5.2. Sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL, shall be reported as "Detected, but Not Quantified," or DNQ. The estimated chemical concentration of the sample shall also be reported.

For purposes of data collection, the Discharger shall require the laboratory to write the estimated chemical concentration next to DNQ. The laboratory may, if such information is available, include numerical estimates of the data quality for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy (\pm a percentage of the reported value), numerical ranges (low to high), or any other means the laboratory considers appropriate.

- 7.2.5.3. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected", or ND.
- 7.2.5.4. The Discharger shall instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the minimum level (ML) value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
- 7.2.6. **Compliance Determination.** Compliance with effluent limitations shall be determined using sample reporting protocols defined above, in the Fact Sheet, and in Attachments A, D, and G. For purposes of reporting and administrative enforcement by the Regional Water Board and State Water Board, the Discharger shall be deemed out of compliance with effluent limitations if the concentration of the pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and, if applicable, greater than or equal to the RL.
- 7.3. **Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs).** DMRs are U.S. EPA reporting requirements. The Discharger shall electronically certify and submit DMRs together with SMRs using Electronic Self-Monitoring Reports module eSMR 2.5 or the latest upgraded version. Electronic DMR submittal shall be in addition to electronic SMR submittal. Information about electronic DMR submittal is available at the [DMR website](https://waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/discharge_monitoring) (waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/discharge_monitoring).

APPENDIX E-1 CHRONIC TOXICITY DEFINITION OF TERMS AND SCREENING PHASE REQUIREMENTS

1. Definition of Terms

- 1.1. Continuous Discharger.** Discharger that discharges without interruption throughout its operating hours, except for infrequent shutdowns for maintenance, process changes, or other similar activities, and that discharges throughout the calendar year.
- 1.2. Non-Continuous Discharger.** Discharger that does not discharge in a continuous manner or does not discharge throughout the calendar year (e.g., intermittent and seasonal dischargers).

2. Chronic Toxicity Species Sensitivity Screening

- 2.1.** The Discharger shall perform species sensitivity screening as specified in Toxicity Provisions section III.C.2:
- 2.1.1. The Discharger shall conduct species sensitivity screening and submit a technical report that identifies the most sensitive test species within 18 months of the effective date of this Order if the Discharger has not previously conducted a species sensitivity screening as specified in section III.C.2 of the Toxicity Provisions.
- 2.1.2. The Discharger shall conduct a species sensitivity screening and submit a technical report that identifies the most sensitive test species with the application for permit reissuance. Alternatively, the Discharger may provide species sensitivity screening results from a previous sensitive species screening conducted within the 15 years before the expiration date of this Order if that sensitive species screening was conducted as specified in Toxicity Provisions section III.C.2.
- 2.1.3. The Discharger shall conduct species sensitivity screening and submit a technical report that identifies the most sensitive test species no later than 18 months after any significant change in the nature of the effluent discharged due to changes in sources or treatment, except those changes resulting from reductions in pollutant concentrations attributable to source control efforts.
- 2.2.** Species sensitivity screening shall, at a minimum, reflect the following elements:
- 2.2.1 Test species specified in Appendix E-2, attached, and protocols referenced in those tables. Test species shall be Tier I unless those species are unavailable. In such cases, the Executive Officer may approve a Tier II test species.

- 2.2.2. Continuous Dischargers: four sets of tests, one in each calendar quarter of a calendar year.

Non-continuous Dischargers: at least two sets of tests, one in each calendar quarter with at least 15 days of discharge, unless the Discharger discharges in only one quarter of a calendar year; in that case, both sets of testing shall occur during the same calendar quarter. Testing in a specific species sensitivity screening can be conducted using effluent that is not discharged into surface waters (e.g., effluent discharged onto land because of a summer prohibition on discharges into surface waters) as long as the effluent tested is representative of the effluent that will be discharged to surface waters.

- 2.2.3. Appropriate controls as required by the applicable U.S. EPA test method for the selected test species.
- 2.2.4. Tests conducted at a waste concentration of 10 percent or the IWC, whichever represents a higher concentration of effluent. Alternatively, the Executive Officer may specify a higher waste concentration if needed to increase the likelihood that potential effects might be observed.
- 2.3. The Discharger shall submit a species sensitivity screening proposal at least 30 days prior to initiating any species sensitivity screening. The proposal shall address each of the elements listed above.
- 2.4. Unless the Executive Officer specifies otherwise, the most sensitive species shall be the species exhibiting the highest percent effect.

APPENDIX E-2

SUMMARY OF TOXICITY TEST SPECIES REQUIREMENTS

Table AE-1. West Coast Marine Chronic Toxicity Test Species and Methods

| Species | Scientific Name | Tier | Effect | Test Duration | Reference |
|------------------------------|---|------|---|--------------------|-----------|
| Giant kelp | <i>Macrocystis pyrifera</i> | I | Percent germination; germ tube length | 48 hours | 1 |
| Red Abalone | <i>Haliotis rufescens</i> | I | Larval development | 48 hours | 1 |
| Oyster Mussel | <i>Crassostrea gigas</i> <i>Mytilus sp.</i> | I | Larval development | 48 hours | 1 |
| Purple Urchin Sand dollar | <i>Strongylocentrotus purpuratus</i> <i>Dendraster excentricus</i> | I | Percent fertilization or larval development | 1 hour or 72 hours | 1 |
| Shrimp | <i>Americamysis bahia</i> | II | Percent survival; growth | 7 days | 2 |
| Topsmelt | <i>Atherinops affinis</i> | I | Percent survival; growth | 7 days | 1 |
| Silverside | <i>Menidia beryllina</i> | II | Larval growth rate; percent survival | 7 days | 2 |

Toxicity Test References:

1. Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluent and Receiving Waters to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms. EPA/600/R-95/136. August 1995.
2. Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluent and Receiving Waters to Marine and Estuarine Organisms. EPA/821/R-02/014. October 2002.

Table AE-2. Freshwater Chronic Toxicity Test Species and Method

| Species | Scientific Name | Tier | Effect | Test Duration | Reference |
|----------------|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Fathead minnow | <i>Pimephales promelas</i> | I | Survival; growth rate | 7 days | 1 |
| Water flea | <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i> | I | Survival; number of young | 7 days | 1 |
| Green Alga | <i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i> | I | Final cell density | 4 days | 1 |

Toxicity Test Reference:

1. Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, fourth Edition Chronic manual (EPA-821-R-02-013, October 2002).

Table AE-3. Toxicity Test Requirements for Species Sensitivity Screening


| Requirements | Discharges to Marine or Estuarine Water (San Francisco Bay) ^[1] | Discharges to Freshwater ^[1] |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Taxonomic diversity | 1 plant 1 invertebrate 1 fish | 1 plant 1 invertebrate 1 fish |
| Screening Requirement | A total of 3 Marine and/or Freshwater species from Table AE-1 and Table AE-2 | 3 Freshwater species from Table AE-2 ^[2] |

Footnotes:


- ^[1] (a) "Marine" refers to receiving water salinities greater than 1.0 parts per thousand (ppt) at least 95 percent of the time during a normal water year.
- (b) "Freshwater" refers to receiving water with salinities less than 1.0 ppt at least 95 percent of the time during a normal water year.
- (c) "Estuarine" refers to all other cases (i.e., when receiving water salinity is above 1.0 less than 95 percent of the time and below 1.0 less than 95% of the time).
- ^[2] The freshwater species may be substituted with a marine species if:
- (a) The salinity of the effluent is above 1 ppt greater than 95 percent of the time, or
- (b) The ionic strength (TDS or conductivity) of the effluent at the IWC is documented to be toxic to the test species.

APPENDIX E-3:

TOXICITY REDUCTION EVALUATION PROCESS FLOWCHART FOR DISCHARGERS WITHOUT EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS



SURVEILLANCE MONITORING



ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. PERMIT INFORMATION | F-3 |
| 2. FACILITY DESCRIPTION | F-5 |
| 3. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS | F-10 |
| 4. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS | F-13 |
| 4.1. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS | F-13 |
| 4.2. TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS..... | F-14 |
| 4.2.1. <i>Scope and Authority</i> | <i>F-14</i> |
| 4.2.2. <i>Technology-Based Effluent Limitations</i> | <i>F-15</i> |
| 4.3. WATER QUALITY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS | F-15 |
| 4.3.1. <i>Scope and Authority</i> | <i>F-15</i> |
| 4.3.2. <i>Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives</i> | <i>F-16</i> |
| 4.3.3. <i>Reasonable Potential Analysis</i> | <i>F-22</i> |
| 4.3.4. <i>Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations</i> | <i>F-28</i> |
| 4.4. DISCHARGE REQUIREMENT CONSIDERATIONS..... | F-34 |
| 5. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS..... | F-37 |
| 6. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS | F-37 |
| 6.1. STANDARD PROVISIONS..... | F-37 |
| 6.2. MONITORING AND REPORTING PROVISIONS..... | F-37 |
| 6.3. SPECIAL PROVISIONS..... | F-38 |
| 6.3.1. <i>Reopener Provisions</i> | <i>F-38</i> |
| 6.3.2. <i>Effluent Characterization Study and Report</i> | <i>F-38</i> |
| 6.3.3. <i>Pollutant Minimization Program</i> | <i>F-38</i> |
| 6.3.4. <i>Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works</i> | <i>F-38</i> |
| 6.3.5. <i>Other Special Provisions</i> | <i>F-39</i> |
| 7. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS | F-40 |
| 8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION..... | F-42 |

TABLES

| | |
|---|------|
| TABLE F-1. FACILITY INFORMATION..... | F-3 |
| TABLE F-2. PREVIOUS EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND MONITORING DATA..... | F-6 |
| TABLE F-3. EFFLUENT LIMIT VIOLATIONS | F-7 |
| TABLE F-4. COLLECTION SYSTEM AND CATEGORY 1 SSO RATES..... | F-8 |
| TABLE F-5. BENEFICIAL USES | F-10 |
| TABLE F-6. SECONDARY TREATMENT STANDARDS..... | F-15 |
| TABLE F-7. SITE-SPECIFIC TRANSLATORS | F-21 |
| TABLE F-8. REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS | F-23 |
| TABLE F-9. MINIMUM INITIAL DILUTION | F-29 |
| TABLE F-10. WQBEL CALCULATIONS | F-32 |
| TABLE F-11. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY | F-41 |

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 section 2.2 of the Order, the Regional Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as findings supporting the issuance of the Order.

1. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the facility.

Table F-1. Facility Information

| | |
|--|--|
| WDID | 2 071039001 |
| CIWQS Place ID | 253174 |
| Discharger | Rodeo Sanitary District |
| Facility Name | Rodeo Sanitary District Water Pollution Control Facility and its collection system |
| Facility Address | 800 San Pablo Avenue Rodeo, CA 94572 Contra Costa County |
| Facility Contact, Title, Phone, and Email | Steven S. Beall, District Manager (510) 799-2970 bealls@rodeosan.org |
| Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports | Same as Facility Contact |
| Mailing Address | Same as Facility Address |
| Billing Address | Same as Facility Address |
| Facility Type | Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW) |
| Major or Minor Facility | Major |
| Water Quality Threat | 1 |
| Complexity | A |
| Pretreatment Program | No |
| Reclamation Requirements | N/A |
| Mercury and PCBs Requirements | NPDES Permit CA0038849 |
| Nutrients Requirements | NPDES Permit CA0038873 |
| Facility Permitted Flow | 1.14 million gallons per day (MGD) – average dry weather flow |
| Facility Design Flow | 1.14 MGD – average dry weather flow 3.4 MGD – peak wet weather flow |
| Watershed | San Pablo Bay Basin |
| Receiving Water | San Pablo Bay |
| Receiving Water Type | Estuarine |
| Date of Last Inspection | August 18, 2021 |

1.1. The Rodeo Sanitary District (Discharger) owns and operates the Rodeo Sanitary District Pollution Control Facility and its wastewater collection system (collectively,

the Facility). The Facility provides secondary treatment of wastewater collected from its service area and discharges to San Pablo Bay.

For the purposes of this Order, references to the “discharger” or “permittee” in applicable federal and State laws, regulations, plans, and policies are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

- 1.2.** The Discharger is regulated pursuant to NPDES Permit CA0037826. The Discharger is authorized to discharge subject to the WDRs in this Order at the discharge locations described in Table 1 of this Order.
- 1.3.** The Discharger was previously subject to Order R2-2017-0034 (previous order) as amended by R2-2021-0019 and R2-2021-0028.
 - Order R2-2021-0028 amended Order R2-2016-0008 and the previous order to provide updated monitoring requirements and require supplemental funding for the Regional Monitoring Program (RMP).
 - Order R2-2021-0019 amended the previous order to update effluent limits and monitoring requirements for total residual chlorine and remove effluent limits and monitoring requirements for oil and grease.

Provisions of these orders have been incorporated into this Order as appropriate and applicable.

- 1.4.** The Discharger filed a Report of Waste Discharge and submitted an application for reissuance of its Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and NPDES permit by January 31, 2022.
- 1.5.** Regulations in 40 C.F.R. section 122.46 limit the duration of NPDES permits to a fixed term not to exceed five years. Accordingly, this Order limits the effective period for the discharge authorization. Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 122.6(d) and California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 2235.4, the terms and conditions of an expired permit are automatically continued pending reissuance of the permit if the Discharger complies with all requirements for continuation of expired permits.
- 1.6.** The Discharger is also regulated under NPDES Permits CA0038849 and CA0038873, which establish requirements on mercury and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and nutrients from wastewater discharges to San Francisco Bay. This Order does not affect those permits.
- 1.7.** When applicable, State law requires dischargers to file a petition with the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that decreases the flow in any portion of a watercourse. The State Water Board retains separate jurisdictional authority to

enforce such requirements under Water Code section 1211. This is not an NPDES permit requirement.

2. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

2.1. Wastewater Collection and Treatment

- 2.1.1. **Location and Service Area.** The wastewater treatment plant is located at 800 San Pablo Avenue in Rodeo. It provides secondary treatment of domestic and commercial wastewater for Rodeo and Tormey, which are unincorporated areas of Contra Costa County. The Facility serves a population of about 10,500 people. Attachment B shows a map of the area around the Facility.
- 2.1.2. **Collection System.** The collection system is a separate sewer system comprised of approximately 27 miles of pipes and two pump stations.
- 2.1.3. **Wastewater Treatment.** The wastewater treatment process consists of comminutors at the influent pump station, fine screening, aerated grit removal, primary clarification, activated sludge biological treatment, secondary clarification, disinfection with sodium hypochlorite, and dechlorination using sodium bisulfite. The treatment plant has an average daily treatment capacity of up to 1.14 million gallons per day (MGD) and a peak wet weather capacity of 3.4 MGD (peak one-hour average flow). From November 2020 through October 2021, the plant treated an overall daily average of 0.54 MGD and a single day maximum average of 3.0 MGD. Attachment C provides the treatment plant flow schematic.
- 2.1.4. **Sludge and Biosolids Management.** The Discharger thickens primary and secondary sludge with a rotary drum thickener, treats the combined sludge with anaerobic digestion, and dewateres the combined sludge with a centrifuge and then drying beds. Biosolids are currently hauled to the Potrero Hills Landfill in Suisun City for use as alternative daily cover. The Discharger is considering composting and land application of biosolids for future disposal practices.
- 2.1.5. **Stormwater Management.** All stormwater flows in contact with equipment or wastewater at the treatment plant are collected and directed to the plant headworks for treatment. Therefore, no additional stormwater requirements are necessary.
- 2.2. **Discharge Point and Receiving Waters.** Discharge of treated effluent to San Pablo Bay is through a submerged, multi-port diffuser located approximately 3,775 feet offshore (Discharge Point 001) at a depth of 16.7 feet below mean sea level and about 5 inches from the San Pablo Bay floor. The 120-foot diffuser consists of 15 pairs of diffuser ports (30 ports total) placed 8 feet apart on center. The 2.5-inch diameter ports are sharp-edged. According to an outfall pipeline inspection conducted in August 2020, one of the diffuser ports is blocked by a man-made plug, although the District has no record of any modification of the

diffuser. The contracted diving company was unsure if the plug could be removed without damaging the port/diffuser structure. The District plans to leave the diffuser with 29 ports in operation. Based on the outfall configuration, the discharge is considered a deepwater discharge as defined in Basin Plan section 4.6.1.

2.3. Previous Requirements and Monitoring Data. The table below presents the previous order's effluent limitations and representative monitoring data from the previous order term:

Table F-2. Previous Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data

| Parameter | Unit | Average Monthly Limit | Average Weekly Limit | Maximum Daily Limit | Other Limit | Long-Term Average ^[1] | Highest Daily Value ^[1] |
|--|------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5 day @ 20°C) (CBOD) | mg/L | 25 | 40 | - | - | 4.8 | 72 |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) | mg/L | 30 | 45 | - | - | 7.5 | 94 |
| CBOD percent removal | % | 85 (minimum) | - | - | - | 98 | 95 ^[2] |
| TSS percent removal | % | 85 (minimum) | - | - | - | 98 | 92 ^[2] |
| Oil and Grease | mg/L | 10 | - | 20 | - | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| pH | s.u. | - | - | - | 6.0 – 9.0 ^[3] | 7 | 6.0 – 8.4 ^[4] |
| Chlorine, Total Residual | | | | | 0.0 ^[5] | | < 0.01 |
| Enterococcus Bacteria | MPN/100 mL | 35 ^[6] | | - | - | 2.2 ^[6] | 19 ^[7] |
| Total Coliform Bacteria | MPN/100 mL | | | | 240 ^[7] | 102 ^[7] | 1700 ^[8] |
| Total Coliform Bacteria | MPN/100 mL | | | | 10,000 ^[8] | 538 | 9,200 |
| Ammonia, Total | mg/L | 54 | - | 140 | - | 6.7 | 38 |
| Copper, Total Recoverable | µg/L | 71 | - | 120 | - | 5.6 | 67 |
| Cyanide, Total | µg/L | 20 | - | 40 | - | 4.4 | 10 |
| Chlorodibromomethane | µg/L | 340 | - | 680 | - | 15 | 46 |
| Dioxin TEQ | µg/L | 1.4 x 10 ⁻⁸ | - | 2.8 x 10 ⁻⁸ | - | ND ^[9] | ND ^[9] |
| Acute Toxicity | % Survival | - | - | - | Not less than 90% (11-sample median) | 100 | 100 ^[10] |
| Acute Toxicity | % Survival | - | - | - | Not less than 70% (11-sample 90 th percentile) | 98 | 90 ^[10] |

| Parameter | Unit | Average Monthly Limit | Average Weekly Limit | Maximum Daily Limit | Other Limit | Long-Term Average ^[1] | Highest Daily Value ^[1] |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Chronic Toxicity | TU _c | 51 | - | 140 | | 17 | 72.6 ^[11] |

Footnotes:

- ^[1] Based on monitoring data from November 2017 through May 2022.
- ^[2] This value is the lowest percent removal value on a monthly basis.
- ^[3] The limit was expressed as an instantaneous minimum and instantaneous maximum.
- ^[4] The range is of the lowest and highest pH values.
- ^[5] The limit was expressed as an instantaneous maximum.
- ^[6] The value is a monthly geometric mean, matching the effluent limitation of the previous order.
- ^[7] The value is a 5-sample moving median, matching the effluent limitation of the previous order.
- ^[8] The limit was expressed as a single sample maximum.
- ^[9] All values were non-detect for this permit term.
- ^[10] This value is the lowest percent survival.
- ^[11] This value is based on testing the freshwater species *Ceriodaphnia dubia*.

2.4. Compliance Summary

2.4.1. **Treatment Plant.** The Discharger violated its effluent limitations six times during the period from November 1, 2017, through May 31, 2022.

Table F-3. Effluent Limit Violations

| Date of Violation | Violation | Units | Effluent Limitation | Reported Value |
|-------------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 2/14/2019 | Mercury (Weekly Average) | µg/L | 0.072 ^[1] | 0.09 |
| 8/12/2019 | Chronic Toxicity (Monthly Average) | TU _c | 51 | 73 |
| 7/17/2020 | Total Suspended Solids (Weekly Average) | mg/L | 45 | 48 |
| 8/24/2020 | Chronic Toxicity (Monthly Average) | TU _c | 51 | 59 |
| 10/05/2020 | Total Coliform (5-sample Median) | MPN/100 mL | 240 | 350 |
| 12/14/2020 | Total Coliform (5-sample Median) | MPN/100 mL | 240 | 1700 |

Footnote:

- ^[1] NPDES Permit CA0038849 (Order R2-2017-0041) contains this mercury effluent limitation.

On February 14, 2019, the Discharger exceeded the weekly average limit for mercury in NPDES Permit CA0038849 (Order R2-2017-0041) with a value of 0.09 µg/L. Following the exceedance, the Discharger performed weekly mercury testing through May 2019, with a maximum result of 0.019 µg/L. No specific mercury source or cause was identified.

In August 2019 and 2020, the Discharger exceeded the previous order's monthly average limit for chronic toxicity. In each case, the Discharger began accelerated monitoring until the results fell below the previous order's single sample trigger of 10 TUc. The Discharger investigated possible causes of the toxicity and determined that samples de-chlorinated in the laboratory exhibited no toxicity, but samples from the onsite dechlorination system were toxic. In response, the Discharger cleaned its effluent wet well. The Discharger has not observed significant chronic toxicity since cleaning the wet well in September 2020 and using samples dechlorinated in the laboratory.

In July 2020, the Discharger exceeded the weekly average limit for total suspended solids. This was caused by an operational control problem with its aeration system that the Discharger resolved within one week.

In October and December 2020, the Discharger exceeded the 5-sample median total coliform limit. The Discharger began accelerated monitoring in November 2020, which continued until the end of January 2021. The Discharger increased the sodium hypochlorite dosage to increase the concentration of chlorine in the contact tank, which brought the total coliform levels back into compliance.

- 2.4.2. **Collection System.** The table below summarizes the Discharger's Category 1 sanitary sewer overflow (SSO) rates for the last five years. Category 1 SSOs are those that reach waters of the United States and thus may violate Prohibition 3.5 of this Order.

Table F-4. Collection System and Category 1 SSO Rates

(Values based on CIWQS data analysis completed in August 2022) ^[1]

| | Length (miles) ^[2] | Average Pipe Age (years) ^[3] | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------------------------|--|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Discharger | 27 | 49 | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Francisco Bay Region | 19,600 | 48 | 1.5 | 0.64 | 1.2 | 0.61 | 1.0 |
| State of California | 112,700 | 46 | 0.67 | 0.38 | 0.56 | 0.33 | 0.46 |

Footnotes:

^[1] The State Water Board's *Enrollee's Guide to the SSO Database* defines "Total number of SSOs per 100 miles of Sewer" as "...the number of SSOs, for which the reporting enrollee is responsible, for every 100 miles of pipe or sewer lines in an enrollee's sanitary sewer system. Due to the large variation in facility specific characteristics, this metric should only be viewed as a rough comparison of the operation and maintenance performance of enrollees and their sanitary sewer systems."

^[2] Lengths shown are based on 2021 data.

^[3] The average pipe age for the State of California is estimated based on the percentages of piping constructed during each decade as reported by enrollees under State Water Board Order 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC.

The above SSO rates are normalized relative to a distance of 100 miles. During the previous order term, the Discharger's Category 1 SSO rates were below the San Francisco Bay Region and statewide rates. The SSO rate in 2018 corresponds to one SSO in the year. During the previous permit term, the

Discharger completed sewer rehabilitation on about 1.3 miles of sewer pipe. The Discharger inspects and cleans its collection system at a rate that covers its entire system every 5 years. The Discharger also performed public outreach promoting preventative measures to minimize wipes and fats, oils, and grease (FOG) in the collection system, and provided information related to private sewer lateral maintenance and rehabilitation.

2.5. Sea Level Rise. The Discharger is in the process of identifying possible impacts, reviewing options, and developing plans. The Discharger expects to complete a planning level report by the end of 2027. In its response to a sea level rise questionnaire the Regional Water Board sent on April 14, 2021, the Discharger noted that its location has a high groundwater table, and thus the Facility structures were built in the 1970's to resist the effects of a high groundwater table. Future studies will review the efficacy of these existing accommodations and recommend modifications as necessary.

2.6. Recycled Water. The Discharger uses its treated effluent onsite for Facility operations but does not currently produce or distribute recycled water. The volume of water produced by the Facility is small, but there are ongoing discussions with neighboring agencies regarding a joint recycled water project to provide recycled water to the Philips 66 Refinery in Rodeo.

2.7. Planned Changes. The Discharger has planned a series of plant improvements through its Comprehensive Energy and Infrastructure Upgrade Project. The projects will target the following areas:

- *Aeration Basin:* Replacement of aging diffusers with diffusers that provide an optimum combination of diffuser efficiency, submergence, basin coverage, and capital cost. Installation of Hach combination ammonia and nitrate sensors to simultaneously track ammonia and nitrate concentrations and provide additional data on nitrification.
- *Control of Wasting Operations:* Conversion from manual pump operation of waste activated sludge (WAS) to the dewatering system to a continuous / automated wasting system process.
- *Biosolids Processing:* Replacement of the current centrifuge with a screw press, which is expected to reduce operation intervention and maintenance costs, produce more consistent percent solids, and serve as a backup method to dewatering. This will allow for the existing drying beds to be decommissioned and used for solar photovoltaic generation in the future. Additionally, a thermal dryer is currently in design and is expected to be installed along with the screw press.
- *Effluent Pumps:* The Discharger is planning to use battery storage to exercise its pumps to avoid instantaneous power draw from the grid.

These changes are mentioned here for informational purposes only and are not requirements of this Order, except to the extent that they pertain to ensuring Facility reliability. Their inclusion here does not imply Regional Water Board authorization. The Discharger may need to obtain necessary permits or permit modifications to implement the changes.

3. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the requirements and authorities described in this section.

3.1. Legal Authorities. This Order serves as WDRs pursuant to California Water Code article 4, chapter 4, division 7 (commencing with § 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to federal Clean Water Act (CWA) section 402 and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA, and Water Code chapter 5.5, division 7 (commencing with § 13370). It serves as an NPDES permit authorizing the Discharger to discharge into waters of the United States at the discharge location described in Table 1 subject to the WDRs in this Order.

3.2. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code division 13, chapter 3 (commencing with § 21100).

3.3. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans

3.3.1. Water Quality Control Plan. The Regional Water Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin* (Basin Plan), which designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan. In addition, this Order implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established State policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Because of the marine influence on San Pablo Bay, total dissolved solids levels exceed 3,000 mg/L; therefore, San Pablo Bay meets an exception to State Water Board Resolution 88-63. Therefore, the beneficial uses applicable to San Pablo Bay are as follows:

Table F-5. Beneficial Uses

| Discharge Point | Receiving Water | Beneficial Uses |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 001 | San Pablo Bay | Industrial Service Supply (IND) Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM) Estuarine Habitat (EST) Fish Migration (MIGR) Preservation of Rare and Endangered Species (RARE) |

| Discharge Point | Receiving Water | Beneficial Uses |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| | | Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL) Fish Spawning (SPWN) Wildlife Habitat (WILD) Water Contact Recreation (REC1) Non-Contact Water Recreation (REC2) Navigation (NAV) |

- 3.3.2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** The NTR and CTR contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants. U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on December 22, 1992, and amended it on May 4, 1995, and November 9, 1999. About 40 NTR criteria apply in California. U.S. EPA adopted the CTR on May 18, 2000. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and incorporated the NTR criteria that applied in the State. U.S. EPA amended the CTR on February 13, 2001.
- 3.3.3. **State Implementation Policy.** The State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP) on March 2, 2000. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives, and provisions for chronic toxicity control. The SIP became effective on April 28, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria U.S. EPA promulgated for California through the NTR and the priority pollutant objectives the Regional Water Board established through the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria U.S. EPA promulgated through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005, that became effective on July 13, 2005. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.
- 3.3.4. **Bacteria Objectives.** The State Water Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California – Part 3, Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality Standards Variance Policy* on August 7, 2018, and it became effective on March 22, 2019. This plan establishes enterococcus bacteria water quality objectives and related implementation provisions for discharges to marine and estuarine waters that support the water contact recreation (REC1) beneficial use.
- 3.3.5. **Sediment Quality.** The State Water Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries – Part 1, Sediment Quality* on September 16, 2008, and it became effective on August 25, 2009. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the plan on June 5, 2018, that became effective on March 11, 2019. This plan establishes sediment quality objectives and related implementation provisions for specifically defined sediments in most bays and estuaries.

- 3.3.6. **Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 require that state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy through State Water Board Resolution 68-16, *Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California*, which incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. Permitted discharges must be consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.
- 3.3.7. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** CWA sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.
- 3.3.8. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code §§ 2050 to 2097) or Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the State, including protecting rare, threatened, or endangered species. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all applicable Endangered Species Act requirements.
- 3.3.9. **Sewage Sludge and Biosolids.** U.S. EPA administers 40 C.F.R. part 503, Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge, which regulates the final use or disposal of sewage sludge generated during the treatment of domestic sewage in a municipal wastewater treatment facility. This Order does not authorize any act that violates those requirements. The Discharger is responsible for meeting applicable requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 503.
- 3.3.10. **Toxicity Provisions.** The State Water Board adopted the *State Policy for Water Quality Control: Toxicity Provisions* (Toxicity Provisions) on October 5, 2021. Following U.S. EPA approval, Toxicity Provisions sections II.C.1 and II.C.2 will establish numeric chronic and acute toxicity objectives that apply to all inland surface waters, enclosed bays, and estuaries in the State with aquatic life beneficial uses. The Toxicity Provisions include related implementation provisions and require that compliance with the chronic toxicity water quality objectives be assessed using U.S. EPA's Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) (U.S. EPA, *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* [EPA/833-R-10-003], June 2010). This

Order will implement the Toxicity Provisions on the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval.

3.4. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA section 303(d) List. On May 11, 2022, U.S. EPA approved a revised list of impaired waters pursuant to CWA section 303(d), which requires identification of specific water bodies where it is expected that water quality standards will not be met after implementation of technology-based effluent limitations on point sources. Where it has not done so already, the Regional Water Board plans to adopt Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for pollutants on the 303(d) list. TMDLs establish wasteload allocations for point sources and load allocations for nonpoint sources and are established to achieve water quality standards.

San Pablo Bay is listed as impaired by mercury, PCBs, dioxin-like PCBs, selenium, chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, invasive species, dioxin compounds (including 2,3,7,8-TCDD), and furan compounds. On February 12, 2008, U.S. EPA approved a TMDL for mercury in San Francisco Bay. On March 29, 2010, U.S. EPA approved a TMDL for PCBs in San Francisco Bay. The TMDLs for mercury and PCBs apply to this discharge and are implemented under NPDES Permit CA0038849. On August 23, 2016, U.S. EPA approved a TMDL for selenium in North San Francisco Bay, which includes San Pablo Bay. The selenium TMDL does not require effluent limits for municipal wastewater dischargers because these discharges have an insignificant impact on North San Francisco Bay water quality.

As shown in Fact Sheet section 4.3.3, the discharge is not a significant source of chlordane, DDT, or dieldrin because these pollutants have not been detected in the discharge. The discharge is also not a source of invasive species because it is disinfected. The discharge is an insignificant source of dioxins and furans because these pollutants were not detected in effluent during the previous order term.

4. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants discharged into waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations: 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards, and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters.

4.1. Discharge Prohibitions

4.1.1. Prohibitions in this Order

- 4.1.1.1. **Discharge Prohibition 3.1 (No discharge other than as described):** This prohibition is based on 40 C.F.R. section 122.21(a) and Water Code section 13260, which require filing an application and Report of Waste Discharge before a discharge can occur. Discharges not described in the application and Report of Waste Discharge, and subsequently in this Order, are prohibited.
- 4.1.1.2. **Discharge Prohibition 3.2 (No bypass to waters of the United States):** This prohibition is based on 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m) (see Attachment D section 1.7).
- 4.1.1.3. **Discharge Prohibition 3.3 (No discharge without minimum initial dilution of at least 75:1):** This prohibition ensures that this Order's effluent limitations remain protective of water quality. The water quality-based effluent limitations and reasonable potential analysis for chronic toxicity in this Order are based on the mixing zones and dilution credits explained in Fact Sheet section 4.3.4.2.
- 4.1.1.4. **Discharge Prohibition 3.4 (No average dry weather flow above 1.14 MGD):** This prohibition ensures that the average dry weather influent flow does not exceed the plant's designed average dry weather treatment capacity (i.e., the historic and tested reliability of the treatment plant) of 1.14 MGD. Exceeding this flow could result in lower treatment reliability and greater potential to violate effluent limitations.
- 4.1.1.5. **Discharge Prohibition 3.5 (No sanitary sewer overflows to waters of the United States):** This prohibition is based on Discharge Prohibition 15 of Basin Plan Table 4-1 and the CWA, which prohibit the discharge of wastewater to surface waters, except as authorized under an NPDES permit. Publicly-owned treatment works must achieve secondary treatment at a minimum and any more stringent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. A sanitary sewer overflow that results in the discharge to waters of the United States of raw sewage or wastewater not meeting this Order's effluent limitations is therefore prohibited under the Basin Plan and CWA.

4.2. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

4.2.1. Scope and Authority

CWA section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting technology-based requirements, at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. The discharges authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on the Secondary Treatment Standards

at 40 C.F.R. section 133 as summarized below. Basin Plan Table 4-2 contains additional requirements for certain pollutants.

Table F-6. Secondary Treatment Standards

| Parameter | Monthly Average | Weekly Average |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) ^{[1] [2]} | 30 mg/L | 45 mg/L |
| Carbonaceous Biochemical Oxygen Demand (CBOD) ^{[1] [2]} | 25 mg/L | 40 mg/L |
| Total Suspended Solids (TSS) ^[2] | 30 mg/L | 45 mg/L |
| pH | 6.0 – 9.0 standard units | |

Footnotes:

^[1] CBOD effluent limitations may be substituted for BOD limitations.

^[2] The monthly average percent removal, by concentration, is not to be less than 85 percent.

4.2.2. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

4.2.2.1. **CBOD and TSS.** The CBOD and TSS effluent limitations, including the 85 percent removal requirements, are based on the secondary treatment standards and Basin Plan Table 4-2

4.2.2.2. **pH.** The pH effluent limitations are based on the secondary treatment standards and Basin Plan Table 4-2.

4.2.2.3. **Total Residual Chlorine.** The total residual chlorine effluent limitation is based on Basin Plan Table 4-2. This technology-based effluent limitation will be replaced by a water quality-based effluent limitation (see Fact Sheet section 4.3.4.4) on the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the chlorine water quality objectives set forth in Regional Water Board Resolution R2-2020-0031.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP, Attachment E) provides an allowance for determining false positives when using continuous devices based on the fact that continuous instruments occasionally have anomalous spikes, and it is chemically improbable to have free chlorine in the presence of sodium bisulfite. The allowance for using only on-the-hour measurements for mandatory minimum penalty assessment purposes under Water Code section 13385.1 is based on a 2004 strategy developed between the Regional Water Board and the Bay Area Clean Water Agencies.

4.3. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations

4.3.1. Scope and Authority

CWA section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require permits to include limitations more stringent than federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve water quality standards. According to 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits must include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are

or may be discharged at levels that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective, water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) must be established using (1) U.S. EPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting a narrative criterion, supplemented with relevant information. The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria, and thereby protect designated beneficial uses of receiving waters.

4.3.2. **Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives**

Discharge Point 001 discharges to San Pablo Bay. Fact Sheet section 3.3.1 identifies the beneficial uses of San Pablo Bay. Water quality criteria and objectives to protect these beneficial uses are described below.

4.3.2.1. **Basin Plan Objectives.** The Basin Plan specifies numerous water quality objectives, including numeric objectives for 10 priority pollutants, un-ionized ammonia, and total residual chlorine, and narrative objectives for toxicity and bioaccumulation.

4.3.2.1.1. **Ammonia.** Basin Plan section 3.3.20 contains water quality objectives for un-ionized ammonia of 0.025 mg/L (as nitrogen) as an annual median and 0.16 mg/L (as nitrogen) as a maximum for Central San Francisco Bay and upstream waters. Effluent and receiving water data are available for total ammonia, but not un-ionized ammonia, because (1) sampling and laboratory methods are unavailable to analyze for un-ionized ammonia, and (2) the fraction of total ammonia that exists in the toxic un-ionized form depends on pH, salinity, and temperature of the receiving water.

To translate the un-ionized ammonia objectives into total ammonia criteria, pH, salinity, and temperature collected at the Davis Point sampling station (BD40) between 1993 and 2001 were used. The un-ionized fraction of the total ammonia was calculated using the following equations (*Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia (Saltwater)*—1989, EPA Publication 440/5-88-004, 1989):

$$\text{Fraction of un-ionized ammonia} = (1 + 10^{[pK - pH]})^{-1}$$

Where, for salinity less than 1 ppt:

$$pK = 0.09018 + 2729.92/T$$

T = temperature in Kelvin

Where, for salinity greater than 10 ppt:

$$pK = 9.245 + 0.116*(I) + 0.0324*(298-T) + 0.0415*(P)/T$$

I = molal ionic strength of saltwater = $19.9273*(S)/(1000-1.005109*S)$

S = salinity (parts per thousand)

T = temperature in Kelvin

P = pressure (one atmosphere)

The 90th percentile and median un-ionized ammonia fractions were then used to express the maximum and annual average un-ionized objectives as acute and chronic total ammonia criteria. This approach is consistent with U.S. EPA guidance on translating dissolved metal water quality objectives to total recoverable metal water quality criteria (U.S. EPA, 1996, *The Metals Translator: Guidance for Calculating a Total Recoverable Limit from a Dissolved Criterion*, EPA Publication 823-B96-007). The equivalent acute and chronic total ammonia criteria are 5.4 mg/L and 1.5 mg/L (as nitrogen).

4.3.2.1.2. **Total Residual Chlorine.** On November 18, 2020, the Regional Water Board adopted Resolution R2-2020-0031 to amend the Basin Plan to eliminate the requirement for a technology-based effluent limit for chlorine of 0.0 mg/L, and to establish water quality objectives for chlorine and a process to implement the new objectives through water quality-based effluent limits. For marine and estuarine waters, the new objectives are 7.5 µg/L as a four-day average and 13 µg/L as a one-hour average (see Basin Plan section 3.3.23). U.S. EPA must approve the new objectives before they become effective.

4.3.2.1.3 **Bioaccumulation and Dioxin-TEQ.** The narrative bioaccumulation objective (Basin Plan § 3.3.2) states, “Many pollutants can accumulate on particulates, in sediments, or bioaccumulate in fish and other aquatic organisms. Controllable water quality factors shall not cause a detrimental increase in concentrations of toxic substances found in bottom sediments or aquatic life. Effects on aquatic organisms, wildlife, and human health will be considered.” Because it is the consensus of the scientific community that dioxins and furans associate with particulates, accumulate in sediments, and bioaccumulate in the fatty tissue of fish and other organisms, the Basin Plan’s narrative bioaccumulation water quality objective applies to these pollutants. Elevated levels of dioxins and furans in San Francisco Bay fish tissue demonstrate that the narrative bioaccumulation water quality objective is not being met. U.S. EPA has therefore placed San Pablo Bay on its 303(d) list of receiving waters where water quality objectives are not being met after imposition of applicable technology-based requirements.

When the CTR was promulgated, U.S. EPA stated its support for the regulation of dioxin and dioxin-like compounds through the use of toxicity

equivalencies (TEQs). U.S. EPA stated, “For California waters, if the discharge of dioxin or dioxin-like compounds has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to a violation of a narrative criterion, numeric water quality-based effluent limits for dioxin or dioxin-like compounds should be included in NPDES permits and should be expressed using a TEQ scheme” (Fed. Reg. Vol. 65, No. 97, pages 31695-31696, May 18, 2000). This Order uses a TEQ scheme based on a set of toxicity equivalency factors (TEFs) the World Health Organization developed in 2005, and a set of bioaccumulation equivalency factors (BEFs) U.S. EPA developed for the Great Lakes region (40 C.F.R. § 132, Appendix F) to convert the concentration of any congener of dioxin or furan into an equivalent concentration of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD). Although the 2005 World Health Organization scheme includes TEFs for dioxin-like PCBs, they are not included in this Order’s TEQ scheme. The CTR has established a specific water quality criterion for PCBs, and dioxin-like PCBs are included in the analysis of total PCBs.

The CTR establishes a numeric water quality objective for 2,3,7,8-TCDD of 1.4×10^{-8} µg/L for the protection of human health when water and aquatic organisms are consumed. This CTR criterion is used as a criterion for dioxin-TEQ because dioxin-TEQ represents a toxicity-weighted concentration equivalent to 2,3,7,8 TCDD, thus translating the narrative bioaccumulation objective into a numeric criterion.

4.3.2.1.4. **Chronic Toxicity**

4.3.2.1.4.1. **Prior to U.S. EPA Approval of the Toxicity Provisions.** Basin Plan section 3.3.18 contains the following chronic toxicity water quality objective:

“All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are lethal to or that produce other detrimental responses in aquatic organisms.... There shall be no chronic toxicity in ambient waters. Chronic toxicity is a detrimental biological effect on growth rate, reproduction, fertilization success, larval development, population abundance, community composition, or any other relevant measure of the health of an organism, population, or community. Attainment of this objective will be determined by analyses of indicator organisms, species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, or toxicity tests..., or other methods selected by the Water Board.”

For this Order, prior to U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, this narrative objective is translated into a numeric criterion of 1.0 TUC. At 1.0 TUC, there is no observable detrimental effect when the indicator organism is exposed to 100 percent effluent; therefore, 1.0 TUC is a direct translation of the narrative objective into a number. Moreover, in

the Technical Support Document (see section 3.3.3, “Step 3: Decision Criteria for Permit Limit Development”), U.S. EPA recommends that 1.0 TUc be used as a criterion continuous concentration (typically a four-day average). It further states that reasonable potential is shown where an effluent is projected to cause an excursion above the criterion continuous concentration. The Technical Support Document applies here as guidance because it directly addresses effluent characterization for whole effluent toxicity.

- 4.3.2.1.4.2. **After U.S. EPA Approval of the Toxicity Provisions.** After U.S. EPA approves the Toxicity Provisions, the following chronic toxicity water quality objective will apply:

H_0 :

mean response (ambient water) \leq 0.75 x mean response (control water)

H_a :

mean response (ambient water) $>$ 0.75 x mean response (control water)

Where:

H_0 = null hypothesis

H_a = alternative hypothesis,

0.75 = regulatory management decision criterion (i.e., 75 percent)

H_0 means the ambient water is toxic when the test organism response in a bioassay is less than or equal to 75 percent of the control response; H_a means the ambient water is not toxic when the test organism response is greater than 75 percent of the control response. For example, if an average of 75 percent of bioassay test organisms or fewer survive when exposed to ambient water relative to the average number that survive when exposed to control water, the ambient water is toxic (i.e., the test result is “fail”). Conversely, if an average of more than 75 percent of bioassay test organisms survive relative to those exposed to control water, the ambient water is not toxic (i.e., the test result is “pass”).

- 4.3.2.2. **CTR Criteria.** The CTR specifies numeric aquatic life and human health criteria for numerous priority pollutants. These criteria apply to inland surface waters and enclosed bays and estuaries. Some human health criteria are for consumption of “water and organisms” and others are for consumption of “organisms only.” The criteria applicable to “organisms only” apply to San Pablo Bay because it is not a source of drinking water.
- 4.3.2.3. **NTR Criteria.** The NTR establishes numeric aquatic life and human health criteria for a number of toxic pollutants for San Francisco Bay waters

upstream to and including Suisun Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The NTR criteria apply to San Pablo Bay.

- 4.3.2.4. **Bacteria Objectives.** The *Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California – Part 3, Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality Standards Variance Policy* establishes enterococcus bacteria water quality objectives to limit cases of gastrointestinal illness from water contact recreation. The enterococcus bacteria objectives apply to marine and estuarine waters.
- 4.3.2.5. **Sediment Quality Objectives.** The *Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries – Part 1, Sediment Quality* contains the following narrative water quality objectives:
- 4.3.2.5.1. “Pollutants in sediments shall not be present in quantities that, alone or in combination, are toxic to benthic communities in bays and estuaries of California.” This objective is to be implemented by integrating three lines of evidence: sediment toxicity, benthic community condition, and sediment chemistry. The policy requires that if the Regional Water Board determines that a discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of this objective, it is to impose the objective as a receiving water limit.
- 4.3.2.5.2. “Pollutants shall not be present in sediments at levels that will bioaccumulate in aquatic life to levels that are harmful to human health in bays and estuaries of California.” This objective is to be implemented by a three-tiered procedure based on pollutant concentrations in sediment and fish tissue.
- 4.3.2.5.3. “Pollutants shall not be present in sediment at levels that alone or in combination are toxic to wildlife and resident finfish by direct exposure or bioaccumulate in aquatic life at levels that are harmful to wildlife or resident finfish by indirect exposure in bays and estuaries of California.” This objective is to be implemented on a case-by-case basis, based upon an ecological risk assessment.
- 4.3.2.6. **Receiving Water Salinity.** Basin Plan section 4.6.2 (like the CTR and NTR) states that the salinity characteristics (i.e., freshwater vs. saltwater) of the receiving water are to be considered in determining the applicable water quality objectives. Freshwater criteria apply to discharges to waters with salinities equal to or less than one part per thousand (ppt) at least 95 percent of the time. Saltwater criteria apply to discharges to waters with salinities equal to or greater than 10 ppt at least 95 percent of the time in a normal water year. For discharges to water with salinities in between these two categories, or tidally-influenced freshwaters that support estuarine beneficial uses, the water quality objectives are the lower of the salt or freshwater

criteria (the latter calculated based on ambient hardness) for each substance.

San Pablo Bay is estuarine based on salinity data the U.S. Geological Survey collected at Station 11 (the closest monitoring point to the Discharger's outfall) between January 2012 and May 2022. During that period, the average salinity was 20 ppt, with a range from 3.7 to 27 ppt. Because the salinity was greater than 10 ppt in 93 percent of the samples, the reasonable potential analysis and effluent limitations in this Order are based on the more stringent of the freshwater and saltwater water quality objectives.

- 4.3.2.7. **Receiving Water Hardness.** Ambient hardness data were used to calculate freshwater water quality objectives that are hardness dependent. A hardness value of 48 mg/L as calcium carbonate was used to determine those objectives. This is the lowest hardness value observed at the Davis Point RMP station (BD40) from April 1995 through August 2001.
- 4.3.2.8. **Metals Translators.** Regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(c), require effluent limitations for metals to be expressed as total recoverable metal. Since the water quality objectives for metals are typically expressed as dissolved metal, translators must be used to convert metals concentrations from dissolved to total recoverable and vice versa. The CTR contains default translators; however, site-specific conditions, such as water temperature, pH, total suspended solids, and organic carbon may affect the form of metal (dissolved, non-filterable, or otherwise) present and therefore available to cause toxicity. In general, dissolved metals are more available and more toxic to aquatic life than other forms. Site-specific translators can account for site-specific conditions, thereby preventing overly stringent or under-protective water quality objectives.

For the discharge to San Pablo Bay, CTR default translators were used for all metals other than copper, nickel, and zinc. Basin Plan Table 7.2.1-2 sets forth site-specific copper translators. The Clean Estuary Partnership's *North of the Dumbarton Bridge Copper and Nickel Development and Selection of Final Translators* (March 2005) contains site-specific nickel translators. The Discharger's *Analysis of Site-Specific Zinc Translators* (January 4, 2012) contains site-specific zinc translators. These site-specific translators are listed in the table below:

Table F-7. Site-Specific Translators

| Parameter | Chronic Translator | Acute Translator |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------|
| Copper | 0.38 | 0.66 |
| Nickel | 0.27 | 0.57 |
| Zinc | 0.08 | 0.25 |

4.3.3. Reasonable Potential Analysis

- 4.3.3.1. **Available Information.** The reasonable potential analysis for this Order is based on effluent data the Discharger collected from November 2017 through May 2022 and ambient background data summarized in the RMP's *San Francisco Bay California Toxics Rule Priority Pollutant Ambient Water Monitoring Report* (2017), which includes data collected through the RMP at the Yerba Buena RMP station (BC10) from 1993 through 2017, supplemented by additional Bay Area Clean Water Agencies data from *San Francisco Bay Ambient Water Monitoring Interim Report* (2003) and *Ambient Water Monitoring: Final CTR Sampling Update* (2004). For ammonia, the RPA was conducted and WQBELs were calculated using receiving water data collected at the Davis Point RMP monitoring station (BD40).

SIP section 1.4.3 requires that background water quality data be representative of the ambient receiving water that will mix with the discharge. For priority pollutants, the Yerba Buena RMP monitoring station (BC10), relative to other RMP stations best fits SIP guidance for establishing background conditions at Discharge Point 001. For ammonia, receiving water monitoring data from the Davis Point RMP station best represents the water at the edge of the initial mixing zone.

This Order does not contain WQBELs for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential; however, the MRP still requires monitoring for those pollutants. If effluent concentrations are found to have increased significantly, Provision 6.3.2 of the Order requires the Discharger to investigate the sources of the increases and implement remedial measures if the increases pose a threat to receiving water quality.

- 4.3.3.2. **Priority Pollutants, Ammonia, and Dioxin-TEQ.** SIP section 1.3 sets forth the methodology used to assess whether a priority pollutant has reasonable potential to exceed a water quality objective. SIP section 1.3 applies to priority pollutants and is used here for ammonia and dioxin-TEQ as guidance. The analysis begins with identifying the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) observed for each pollutant based on available effluent concentration data and the ambient background concentrations (B). SIP section 1.4.3 states that ambient background concentrations are either the maximum ambient concentration observed or, for water quality objectives intended to protect human health, the arithmetic mean of observed concentrations. There are three triggers in determining reasonable potential:
- **Trigger 1** is activated if the maximum effluent concentration is greater than or equal to the lowest applicable water quality objective ($\text{MEC} \geq \text{water quality objective}$).

- **Trigger 2** is activated if the ambient background concentration observed in the receiving water is greater than the lowest applicable water quality objective ($B > \text{water quality objective}$) and the pollutant is detected in any effluent sample.
- **Trigger 3** is activated if a review of other information indicates that a WQBEL is needed to protect beneficial uses.

The maximum effluent concentrations, most stringent applicable water quality criteria and objectives, and ambient background concentrations used in the analysis are presented in Table F-8, below, along with the reasonable potential analysis results (yes, no, or unknown) for each pollutant. Based on this analysis, cyanide, chlorodibromomethane, and total ammonia exhibit reasonable potential by Trigger 1. Additionally, Basin Plan sections 7.2.1.2 and 4.7.2.2 require copper and cyanide WQBELs for all individual NPDES permits for municipal wastewater treatment facilities. Dioxin-TEQ has reasonable potential because the receiving water is impaired for dioxin-TEQ.

Table F-8. Reasonable Potential Analysis

| CTR No. | Pollutant | C or Governing Criterion or Objective ($\mu\text{g/L}$) | MEC or Minimum DL ($\mu\text{g/L}$) ^{[1],[2]} | B or Minimum DL ($\mu\text{g/L}$) ^{[1],[2]} | RPA Result ^[3] |
|-----------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------------|
| 1 | Antimony | 4,300 | 0.44 DNQ | 1.8 | No |
| 2 | Arsenic | 36 | 1.9 | 2.5 | No |
| 3 | Beryllium | No Criteria | <0.056 | 0.22 | U |
| 4 | Cadmium | 0.6 | <0.05 | 0.13 | No |
| 5a | Chromium (III) ^[4] | 113 | 8 DNQ | 4.4 | No |
| 5b | Chromium (VI) ^[4] | 11.4 | 8 DNQ | 4.4 | No |
| 6 | Copper | 14.2 | 12 | 2.5 | Yes^[5] |
| 7 | Lead | 1.2 | 0.27 DNQ | 0.80 | No |
| 8 | Mercury ^[6] | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | Nickel | 28 | 2.1 | 3.7 | No |
| 10 | Selenium ^[6] | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | Silver | 1.1 | <0.02 | 0.052 | No |
| 12 | Thallium | 6.3 | <0.047 | 0.023 | No |
| 13 | Zinc | 250 | 60 | 5.1 | No |
| 14 | Cyanide | 2.9 | 17 | 0.52 | Yes^[5] |
| 15 | Asbestos (fibers/L) ^[7] | - | - | - | - |
| 16 | 2,3,7,8-TCDD | 1.4×10^{-8} | $<1.18 \times 10^{-6}$ | 2.7×10^{-8} | U |
| | Dioxin TEQ | 1.4×10^{-8} | $<9.9 \times 10^{-7}$ | 4.1×10^{-8} | Yes^[8] |
| 17 | Acrolein | 780 | <1.7 | <0.50 | No |
| 18 | Acrylonitrile | 0.66 | <1.8 | 0.030 | No |
| 19 | Benzene | 71 | <0.18 | <0.050 | No |
| 20 | Bromoform | 360 | 14 | <0.15 | No |

| CTR No. | Pollutant | C or Governing Criterion or Objective (µg/L) | MEC or Minimum DL (µg/L) ^{[1],[2]} | B or Minimum DL (µg/L) ^{[1],[2]} | RPA Result ^[3] |
|-----------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| 21 | Carbon Tetrachloride | 4.4 | <0.16 | 0.060 | No |
| 22 | Chlorobenzene | 21000 | <0.18 | <0.18 | No |
| 23 | Chlorodibromomethane | 34 | 46 | <0.05 | Yes |
| 24 | Chloroethane | No Criteria | <0.38 | <0.38 | U |
| 25 | 2-Chloroethylvinyl ether | No Criteria | <0.28 | <0.28 | U |
| 26 | Chloroform | No Criteria | 27 | <0.19 | U |
| 27 | Dichlorobromomethane | 46 | 37 | <0.050 | No |
| 28 | 1,1-Dichloroethane | No Criteria | <0.19 | <0.050 | No |
| 29 | 1,2-Dichloroethane | 99 | <0.18 | 0.040 | No |
| 30 | 1,1-Dichloroethylene | 3.2 | <0.21 | <0.21 | No |
| 31 | 1,2-Dichloropropane | 39 | <0.18 | <0.050 | No |
| 32 | 1,3-Dichloropropylene | 1,700 | <0.36 | <0.16 | No |
| 33 | Ethylbenzene | 29,000 | <0.26 | <0.26 | No |
| 34 | Methyl Bromide | 4,000 | <0.3 | <0.30 | No |
| 35 | Methyl Chloride | No Criteria | <0.3 | <0.30 | U |
| 36 | Methylene Chloride | 1,600 | <0.4 | 22 | No |
| 37 | 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane | 11 | <0.15 | <0.050 | No |
| 38 | Tetrachloroethylene | 8.85 | <0.19 | <0.050 | No |
| 39 | Toluene | 200,000 | 1.2 | <0.19 | No |
| 40 | 1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene | 140,000 | <0.22 | <0.22 | No |
| 41 | 1,1,1-Trichloroethane | No Criteria | <0.19 | <0.19 | U |
| 42 | 1,1,2-Trichloroethane | 42 | <0.16 | <0.050 | No |
| 43 | Trichloroethylene | 81 | <0.2 | <0.20 | No |
| 44 | Vinyl Chloride | 525 | <0.25 | <0.25 | No |
| 45 | 2-Chlorophenol | 400 | <0.0084 | <0.70 | No |
| 46 | 2,4-Dichlorophenol | 790 | <0.0059 | <0.90 | No |
| 47 | 2,4-Dimethylphenol | 2,300 | <0.4 | <0.80 | No |
| 48 | 2-Methyl- 4,6-Dinitrophenol | 765 | <0.3 | <0.60 | No |
| 49 | 2,4-Dinitrophenol | 14,000 | <0.15 | <0.70 | No |
| 50 | 2-Nitrophenol | No Criteria | <0.4 | <0.80 | U |
| 51 | 4-Nitrophenol | No Criteria | <0.5 | <0.50 | U |
| 52 | 3-Methyl 4-Chlorophenol | No Criteria | <0.5 | <0.80 | U |
| 53 | Pentachlorophenol | 7.9 | <0.054 | <0.60 | No |
| 54 | Phenol | 4,600,000 | 0.068 | <0.50 | No |
| 55 | 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol | 6.5 | <0.0048 | <0.97 | No |
| 56 | Acenaphthene | 2,700 | <0.005 | 0.0020 | No |
| 57 | Acenaphthylene | No Criteria | <0.0049 | 0.0010 | U |
| 58 | Anthracene | 110,000 | <0.0042 | 0.0010 | No |
| 59 | Benzidine | 0.00054 | <0.54 | <0.00030 | No |
| 60 | Benzo(a)Anthracene | 0.049 | <0.018 | 0.0050 | No |
| 61 | Benzo(a)Pyrene | 0.049 | <0.0062 | 0.0020 | No |

| CTR No. | Pollutant | C or Governing Criterion or Objective (µg/L) | MEC or Minimum DL (µg/L) ^{[1],[2]} | B or Minimum DL (µg/L) ^{[1],[2]} | RPA Result ^[3] |
|---------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| 62 | Benzo(b)Fluoranthene | 0.049 | <0.0039 | 0.0050 | No |
| 63 | Benzo(ghi)Perylene | No Criteria | <0.0069 | 0.0030 | U |
| 64 | Benzo(k)Fluoranthene | 0.049 | <0.0061 | 0.0020 | No |
| 65 | Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane | No Criteria | <0.5 | <0.30 | U |
| 66 | Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether | 1.4 | <0.002 | <0.30 | No |
| 67 | Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether | 170,000 | <0.0087 | <0.60 | No |
| 68 | Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate | 5.9 | 0.18 | <0.50 | No |
| 69 | 4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether | No Criteria | <0.44 | <0.23 | U |
| 70 | Butylbenzyl Phthalate | 5,200 | <0.094 | <0.50 | No |
| 71 | 2-Chloronaphthalene | 4,300 | <0.4 | <0.30 | No |
| 72 | 4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether | No Criteria | <0.47 | <0.30 | U |
| 73 | Chrysene | 0.049 | <0.009 | 0.0020 | No |
| 74 | Dibenzo(a,h)Anthracene | 0.049 | <0.0091 | 0.0010 | No |
| 75 | 1,2-Dichlorobenzene | 17,000 | <0.27 | <0.27 | No |
| 76 | 1,3-Dichlorobenzene | 2,600 | <0.18 | <0.18 | No |
| 77 | 1,4-Dichlorobenzene | 2,600 | <0.18 | <0.18 | No |
| 78 | 3,3 Dichlorobenzidine | 0.077 | <0.0079 | <0.00020 | No |
| 79 | Diethyl Phthalate | 120,000 | <0.015 | <0.20 | No |
| 80 | Dimethyl Phthalate | 2,900,000 | <0.011 | <0.20 | No |
| 81 | Di-n-Butyl Phthalate | 12,000 | <0.0066 | <0.50 | No |
| 82 | 2,4-Dinitrotoluene | 9.1 | <0.0064 | <0.27 | No |
| 83 | 2,6-Dinitrotoluene | No Criteria | 0.9 | <0.29 | U |
| 84 | Di-n-Octyl Phthalate | No Criteria | <0.019 | <0.38 | U |
| 85 | 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine | 0.54 | <0.39 | 0.0040 | No |
| 86 | Fluoranthene | 370 | <0.0066 | 0.011 | No |
| 87 | Fluorene | 14,000 | <0.0062 | 0.002 | No |
| 88 | Hexachlorobenzene | 0.00077 | <0.0042 | 0.000020 | No |
| 89 | Hexachlorobutadiene | 50 | <0.0034 | <0.30 | No |
| 90 | Hexachlorocyclopentadiene | 17,000 | <0.3 | <0.30 | No |
| 91 | Hexachloroethane | 8.9 | <0.0066 | <0.20 | No |
| 92 | Indeno(1,2,3-cd)Pyrene | 0.049 | <0.0063 | 0.0040 | No |
| 93 | Isophorone | 600 | <0.5 | <0.30 | No |
| 94 | Naphthalene | No Criteria | 0.024 | 0.0090 | U |
| 95 | Nitrobenzene | 1,900 | <0.5 | <0.25 | No |
| 96 | N-Nitrosodimethylamine | 8.1 | <0.3 | <0.30 | No |
| 97 | N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine | 1.4 | <0.5 | <0.00020 | No |
| 98 | N-Nitrosodiphenylamine | 16 | <0.3 | <0.0010 | No |
| 99 | Phenanthrene | No Criteria | 0.013 DNQ | 0.0060 | U |
| 100 | Pyrene | 11,000 | <0.0055 | 0.019 | No |
| 101 | 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene | No Criteria | <0.087 | <0.30 | U |
| 102 | Aldrin | 0.00014 | <0.002 | <0.0000085 | No |

| CTR No. | Pollutant | C or Governing Criterion or Objective (µg/L) | MEC or Minimum DL (µg/L) ^{[1],[2]} | B or Minimum DL (µg/L) ^{[1],[2]} | RPA Result ^[3] |
|---------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| 103 | Alpha-BHC | 0.013 | <0.003 | 0.00050 | No |
| 104 | Beta-BHC | 0.046 | <0.003 | 0.00040 | No |
| 105 | Gamma-BHC | 0.063 | 0.041 | 0.0010 | No |
| 106 | Delta-BHC | No Criteria | <0.0014 | 0.00010 | U |
| 107 | Chlordane | 0.00059 | <0.02 | 0.00014 | No |
| 108 | 4,4'-DDT | 0.00059 | <0.0017 | 0.00020 | No |
| 109 | 4,4'-DDE | 0.00059 | <0.0018 | 0.0010 | No |
| 110 | 4,4'-DDD | 0.00084 | <0.0011 | 0.00030 | No |
| 111 | Dieldrin | 0.00014 | <0.0014 | 0.00030 | No |
| 112 | Alpha-Endosulfan | 0.0087 | <0.0011 | 0.00010 | No |
| 113 | beta-Endosulfan | 0.0087 | <0.003 | 0.00010 | No |
| 114 | Endosulfan Sulfate | 240 | <0.0033 | 0.00010 | No |
| 115 | Endrin | 0.0023 | <0.0018 | 0.000040 | No |
| 116 | Endrin Aldehyde | 0.81 | <0.004 | <0.0050 | No |
| 117 | Heptachlor | 0.00021 | <0.003 | 0.000020 | No |
| 118 | Heptachlor Epoxide | 0.00011 | <0.0025 | 0.00010 | No |
| 119-125 | PCBs sum ^[6] | - | - | - | - |
| 126 | Toxaphene | 0.00020 | <0.02 | <0.00000082 | No |
| | Total Ammonia (mg/L) | 1.5 | 35 | 0.18 | Yes |

Footnotes:

- ^[1] The MEC and ambient background concentration are the actual detected concentrations unless preceded by a "<" sign, in which case the value shown is the minimum detection level (MDL).
- ^[2] The MEC or ambient background concentration is "Unavailable" when there are no monitoring data for the constituent.
- ^[3] RPA Results = Yes, if MEC ≥ WQC, B > WQC and MEC is detected, or Trigger 3
= No, if MEC and B are < WQC or all effluent data are undetected
= Unknown (U) if no criteria have been promulgated or data are insufficient.
- ^[4] The MEC and maximum ambient background concentrations are the total chromium concentration. The chromium (III) and chromium (VI) concentrations are unknown but less than these values.
- ^[5] Reasonable potential is based in whole or part on Basin Plan sections 7.2.1.2 and 4.7.2.1.
- ^[6] SIP section 1.3 excludes from its reasonable potential analysis procedure priority pollutants for which a TMDL has been developed. TMDLs have been developed for mercury and PCBs in San Francisco Bay. Mercury and PCBs from wastewater discharges are regulated by NPDES Permit CA0038849, which implements the San Francisco Bay Mercury and PCBs TMDLs. A TMDL has also been developed for selenium in North San Francisco Bay, which includes San Pablo Bay. Basin Plan section 7.2.4.5 finds that municipal wastewater dischargers have no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to the selenium impairment in San Francisco Bay segments and, therefore, are not required to have numeric effluent limitations.
- ^[7] Asbestos sampling is only required for discharges to waters with the municipal or domestic supply (MUN) beneficial use. San Pablo Bay does not have the MUN beneficial use.
- ^[8] Reasonable potential is based on Trigger 3 because San Francisco Bay is 303(d)-listed for dioxin-TEQ and elevated levels of dioxin-TEQ are found in San Francisco Bay fish tissue.

4.3.3.3. Acute Toxicity

4.3.3.3.1. **Prior to U.S. EPA Approval of the Toxicity Provisions.** Basin Plan section 4.5.5.3.1 requires acute toxicity monitoring and limitations.

4.3.3.3.2. **After U.S. EPA Approval of the Toxicity Provisions.** When approved, the Toxicity Provisions will supersede Basin Plan section 4.5.5.3.1 and acute toxicity monitoring and limitations will not be required. During the previous order term, the Discharger monitored its effluent monthly for acute toxicity and did not violate its acute toxicity permit limits. Therefore, there is no reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to acute toxicity in the receiving water.

4.3.3.4. **Chronic Toxicity**

4.3.3.4.1. **Prior to and After U.S. EPA Approval of the Toxicity Provisions.** This Order evaluates reasonable potential for chronic toxicity independent of whether U.S. EPA has approved the Toxicity Provisions.

Toxicity Provisions section III.C.3.a requires a chronic toxicity reasonable potential analysis for publicly owned treatment works permitted to discharge less than 5.0 MGD. The Discharger's facility is a publicly owned treatment works and is permitted to discharge less than 5.0 MGD. Therefore, the Toxicity Provisions will require a reasonable potential analysis.

Toxicity Provisions section III.C.3.c states that reasonable potential exists if any of at least four chronic toxicity tests at the instream waste concentration (IWC) within five years prior to permit reissuance (1) results in a "fail" or (2) has at least a 10 percent effect. If data from these tests were not analyzed using the TST, the data must be re-analyzed using the TST. If previous tests were not conducted at the IWC, then a concentration of effluent higher than the IWC may be used. Data from older tests may also be considered. If a minimum of four chronic toxicity tests is unavailable, the Regional Water Board must require the Discharger to conduct a minimum of four chronic toxicity tests at the IWC and analyze the data using the TST.

The Discharger conducted chronic toxicity tests twice per year during the previous order term using a freshwater species, the water flea (*Ceriodaphnia dubia*). The Toxicity Provisions section III.B.2 indicates that the Regional Water Board may require a freshwater or marine species if the receiving water is classified as estuarine. Since the receiving water exhibits marine characteristics more than 90 percent of the time (see Fact Sheet section 4.3.2.6), the Discharger's recent species sensitivity screening used marine species and identified purple urchin (*Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*) or sand dollar (*Dendraster excentricus*) as the most sensitive species.

The reasonable potential analysis is based on data gathered during the species sensitivity screening. Data for the newly identified marine species were analyzed using the TST. Each of the four tests resulted in a "pass"

and a percent effect of less than 10 at the IWC. Therefore, there was no reasonable potential at the IWC and this Order does not include WQBELs for chronic toxicity. Instead, this Order maintains the previous order's trigger for accelerated monitoring of 10 TU_c based on Basin Plan Table 4-5 until U.S. EPA approves the Toxicity Provisions. It includes effluent targets consistent with Toxicity Provisions section III.C.4.c that will become effective after U.S. EPA approves the Toxicity Provisions.

- 4.3.3.5. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Basin Plan Table 4-2 requires a total residual chlorine effluent limitation for all treatment facilities with the potential to discharge chlorine. Following U.S. EPA approval of the chlorine water quality objectives set forth in Regional Water Board Resolution R2-2020-0031, a WQBEL for total residual chlorine will be required because the Facility disinfects its effluent with chlorine and, without sufficient dechlorination, the discharge could contain chlorine above the new water quality objective.
- 4.3.3.6. **Enterococcus Bacteria.** The *Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California – Part 3, Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality Standards Variance Policy* requires *enterococcus* bacteria effluent limitations for discharges to marine and estuarine receiving waters that support the water contact recreation (REC1) beneficial use.
- 4.3.3.7. **Sediment Quality.** Pollutants in some receiving water sediments may be present in quantities that alone or in combination are toxic to benthic communities. However, to date there is no evidence directly linking compromised sediment conditions to the discharges subject to this Order; therefore, the Regional Water Board cannot draw a conclusion about reasonable potential for these discharges to cause or contribute to exceedances of the sediment quality objectives. Nevertheless, the Discharger continues to participate in the Regional Monitoring Program, which routinely monitors San Francisco Bay sediment and seeks to identify stressors responsible for degraded sediment quality.

4.3.4. **Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations**

WQBELs were developed for the pollutants determined to have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality objectives. With the exception of those for acute toxicity, total residual chlorine (after U.S. EPA approval of the new water quality objectives), and enterococcus bacteria (discussed below), the WQBEL calculations are based on the procedures in SIP section 1.4.

- 4.3.4.1. **WQBEL Expression.** NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(d) require that permit limits for publicly-owned treatment works be expressed as average weekly and average monthly limits, unless impracticable. This Order contains daily limits instead of weekly limits because daily limits better

protect against acute water quality effects and are necessary to prevent fish kills or mortality to aquatic organisms. Weekly limits could allow acute and chronic toxicity to occur over shorter periods (acute and chronic aquatic life criteria are typically expressed as one-hour and four-day averages).

- 4.3.4.2. **Mixing Zones and Dilution Credits.** SIP section 1.4.2 allows mixing zones and dilution credits under certain circumstances. The Discharger submitted a study titled *Technical Memorandum: Near-field Mixing Zone and Dilution Analysis for Chronic Toxicity Discharge Conditions and Current Diffuser Characteristics* (April 14, 2017). The study estimated minimum initial dilution at Discharge Point 001 based on conditions at the time (i.e., two buried diffuser ports and existing flows) and expected future conditions (i.e., all diffuser ports working and projected flows). During an outfall pipeline inspection conducted in August 2020, the contracted inspection company noted that one of the diffuser ports is blocked by a man-made plug, although the Discharger has no record of any modification of the diffuser. The Discharger plans to leave the diffuser as is with 29 ports in operation because removing the plug could damage the diffuser. To ensure its dilution study accurately reflects this change, the Discharger modeled dilution with 29 ports operating and submitted the updated results with its Report of Waste Discharge.

Both analyses were performed using the U.S. EPA-supported CORMIX modeling package. For receiving water conditions, the modeled scenarios used (1) the average velocity 30 minutes after slack tide of 0.41 ft/s (0.12 m/s) to represent acute conditions, (2) the minimum 4-day average velocity of 0.8 ft/s (0.24 m/s) to represent the worst-case scenario for chronic conditions, and (3) the median flood and ebb tides velocities of 1.1 ft/s (0.34 m/s) to represent chronic conditions. To confirm that 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 zone of initial dilution. This is consistent with guidance in U.S. EPA's *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control* (March 1991, EPA/505/2-90-001) that recommends a maximum travel time for a passing organism of 15 minutes. The modeled dilution ratios for each scenario are shown in Table F-9.

Table F-9. Minimum Initial Dilution

| Flow Conditions ^[1] | Previous Order Dilution | Dilution with 29 Ports |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Peak Daily Flow (17 MGD) | 33:1 | 34:1 |
| Peak Four-Day Average Flow (14 MGD) | 75:1 | 75:1 |
| Permitted Dry-Weather Average Flow (5.2 MGD) | 279:1 | 279:1 |

Footnote:

- ^[1] The modeled flow rates are the combined flows from the Facility and the Pinole-Hercules Water Pollution Control Plant because these treatment plants share the deep water outfall.

In each scenario, the updated modeled dilution was the same or higher than the dilution found during the previous study. This Order reflects the updated dilution ratios when calculating WQBELs.

- 4.3.4.2.1. **Bioaccumulative Pollutants.** For certain bioaccumulative pollutants, no mixing zone is established, and dilution credit is denied. Specifically, these pollutants include dioxin and furan compounds, which appear on the CWA section 303(d) list for San Pablo Bay because, based on available data on the concentrations of these pollutants in aquatic organisms, sediment, and the water column, they impair San Pablo Bay beneficial uses. The following factors suggest insufficient assimilative capacity in San Francisco Bay for these pollutants.

Tissue samples taken from San Francisco Bay fish show the presence of these pollutants at concentrations greater than screening levels (Contaminant Concentrations in Fish from San Francisco Bay, May 1997). The results of a 1994 San Francisco Bay pilot study, presented in Contaminated Levels in Fish Tissue from San Francisco Bay (Regional Water Board, 1994) also show elevated levels of chemical contaminants in fish tissues. The Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment completed a preliminary review of the data in the 1994 report and in December 1994 issued an interim consumption advisory covering certain fish species in San Francisco Bay due to the levels of some of these pollutants. The Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment updated this advisory in a May 2011 report, Health Advisory and Safe Eating Guidelines for San Francisco Bay Fish and Shellfish, which still suggests insufficient assimilative capacity in San Francisco Bay for 303(d)-listed pollutants. Therefore, dilution credits are denied for bioaccumulative pollutants on the 303(d) list for which data are lacking on sources and significant uncertainty exists about how different sources contribute to bioaccumulation.

- 4.3.4.2.2. **Non-Bioaccumulative Pollutants (except ammonia and chronic toxicity).** For copper, cyanide, chlorodibromomethane, and enterococcus, mixing zones corresponding to a conservative dilution credit of 10:1 ($D=9$) have been established. The 10:1 dilution credit is based, in part, on Basin Plan Prohibition 1 (Table 4-1), which prohibits discharges with less than 10:1 dilution. SIP section 1.4.2 allows for limiting the dilution credit. The dilution credit is limited for the following reasons:

- 4.3.4.2.2.1. San Francisco Bay is a complex estuarine system with highly variable and seasonal upstream freshwater inflows and diurnal tidal saltwater inputs. SIP section 1.4.3 allows background conditions to be determined on a discharge-by-discharge or water body-by-water body basis. A water body-by-water body approach is taken here due to

inherent uncertainties in characterizing ambient background conditions in a complex estuarine system on a discharge-by-discharge basis.

- 4.3.4.2.2. Because of the complex hydrology of San Francisco Bay, there are uncertainties in accurately determining an appropriate mixing zone. The models used to predict dilution do not consider the three-dimensional nature of San Francisco Bay currents resulting from the interaction of tidal flushes and seasonal freshwater outflows. Being heavier and colder than freshwater, ocean saltwater enters San Francisco Bay on a twice-daily tidal cycle, generally beneath the warmer fresh water that flows seaward. When these waters mix and interact, complex circulation patterns occur due to the varying densities of the fresh and ocean waters. The locations of this mixing and interaction change depending on the strength of each tide. Additionally, sediment loads from the Central Valley change on a long-term basis, affecting the depth of different parts of San Francisco Bay, resulting in alteration of flow patterns, mixing, and dilution at the outfall.
- 4.3.4.2.3. **Ammonia and Total Residual Chlorine.** For ammonia and total residual chlorine, a mixing zone corresponding to a conservative estimate of actual initial dilution of 34:1 (D=33) was used to represent acute conditions. Additionally for ammonia, a mixing zone corresponding to a conservative estimate of actual initial dilution of 279:1 (D=278) was used to represent chronic conditions. This is justified because ammonia and chlorine are both non-persistent pollutants that quickly disperse and degrade to a non-toxic state. As such, cumulative toxicity associated with ammonia or chlorine from other unrelated discharges is unlikely.
- 4.3.4.2.4. **Chronic Toxicity.** For chronic toxicity, a mixing zone corresponding to a conservative estimate of actual initial dilution of 75:1 (D=74) was used. This represents a worst case 4-day average for chronic discharge conditions (see Fact Sheet section 4.3.4.2.). This corresponds to an IWC of 1.3 percent assuming there is no ambient chronic toxicity.
- 4.3.4.3. **WQBEL Calculations.** The following table shows the WQBEL calculations for copper, cyanide, dioxin-TEQ, chlorodibromomethane, and total ammonia in accordance with SIP section 1.4.

Table F-10. WQBEL Calculations

| Pollutant | Copper | Cyanide | Dioxin-TEQ | Chloro-Dibromo-Methane | Total Ammonia (acute) | Total Ammonia (chronic) |
|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Units | µg/L | µg/L | µg/L | µg/L | mg/L N | mg/L N |
| Basis and Criteria type | Basin Plan Site-Specific Objective | Basin Plan Site-Specific Objective | Basin Plan Narrative Objective | CTR Human Health | Basin Plan Aquatic Life Objective | Basin Plan Aquatic Life Objective |
| Criteria -Acute | - | - | - | - | 5.4 | - |
| Criteria -Chronic | - | - | - | - | - | 1.5 |
| Site-Specific Objective Criteria - Acute | 3.9 | 9.4 | - | - | - | - |
| Site-Specific Objective Criteria - Chronic | 2.5 | 2.9 | - | - | - | - |
| Water Effects Ratio (WER) | 2.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Lowest WQO | 2.5 | 2.9 | - | - | 5.4 | 1.5 |
| Site Specific Translator - MDEL | 0.66 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Site Specific Translator - AMEL | 0.38 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Dilution Factor (D) | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 33 | 278 |
| No. of samples per month | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 30 |
| Aquatic life criteria analysis required? (Y/N) | Y | Y | N | N | Y | Y |
| HH criteria analysis required? (Y/N) | N | Y | Y | Y | N | N |
| | | | | | | |
| Applicable Acute WQO | 14.2 | 9.4 | - | - | 5.4 | - |
| Applicable Chronic WQO | 15.8 | 2.9 | - | - | - | 1.5 |
| HH Criteria | - | 220,000 | 1.4×10^{-8} | 34 | - | - |
| Background (Maximum Conc. for Aquatic Life Calc.) | 2.55 | 0.52 | - | - | 0.18 | 0.09 |
| Background (Average Conc. for Human Health Calc.) | - | 0.44 | 2.2×10^{-8} | 0.03 | - | - |
| Is the pollutant on the 303d list and/or bioaccumulative (Y/N)? | N | N | Y | N | N | N |
| | | | | | | |
| ECA Acute | 119 | 89 | - | - | 178 | - |
| ECA Chronic | 135 | 24 | - | - | - | 394 |
| ECA HH | - | 2,200,000 | 1.4×10^{-8} | 340 | - | - |
| | | | | | | |
| No. of data points <10 or at least 80% of data reported non-detect? (Y/N) | N | N | Y | Y | N | N |
| Avg of effluent data points | 5.0 | 7.5 | ND | 17 | 5.2 | 5.2 |
| Std Dev of effluent data points | 1.8 | 2.6 | ND | 16 | 7.8 | 7.8 |

| Pollutant | Copper | Cyanide | Dioxin-TEQ | Chloro-Dibromo-Methane | Total Ammonia (acute) | Total Ammonia (chronic) |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----------|--|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| CV Calculated | 0.36 | 0.34 | N/A | N/A | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| CV (Selected) - Final | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| ECA Acute Mult99 | 0.47 | 0.49 | - | - | 0.14 | - |
| ECA Chronic Mult99 | 0.67 | 0.68 | - | - | - | 0.84 |
| LTA Acute | 56 | 44 | - | - | 26 | - |
| LTA Chronic | 90 | 17 | - | - | - | 329 |
| Minimum of LTAs | 56 | 17 | - | - | 26 | 329 |
| AMEL Mult95 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 1.5 |
| MDEL Mult99 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 6.9 | 6.9 |
| AMEL (Aquatic Life) | 74 | 22 | - | - | 62 | 494 |
| MDEL (Aquatic Life) | 119 | 34 | - | - | 178 | 2280 |
| MDEL/AMEL Multiplier | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | 2.9 | 4.6 |
| AMEL (Human Health) | - | 2,200,000 | 1.4×10^{-8} | 340 | - | - |
| MDEL (Human Health) | - | 3,700,000 | 2.8×10^{-8} | 680 | - | - |
| Minimum of AMEL for Aq. Life vs HH | 74 | 22 | 1.4×10^{-8} | 340 | 62 | 490 |
| Minimum of MDEL for Aq. Life vs HH | 120 | 34 | 2.8×10^{-8} | 680 | 180 | 2280 |
| Previous Order Limit - AMEL | 71 | 20 | 1.4×10^{-8} | 340 | 54 | 54 |
| Previous Order Limit - MDEL | 120 | 40 | 2.8×10^{-8} | 680 | 140 | 140 |
| Final Limit - AMEL | 71 | 20 | 1.4×10^{-8} | 340 | 54 | 54 |
| Final Limit - MDEL | 120 | 34 | 2.8×10^{-8} | 680 | 140 | 140 |

4.3.4.4. **Total Residual Chlorine.** The total residual chlorine effluent limitation is based on Basin Plan Table 4-2. Following U.S. EPA approval of the chlorine water quality objectives set forth in Regional Water Board Resolution R2-2020-0031, this technology-based effluent limitation will be replaced by a WQBEL. For the WQBEL, this Order establishes a mixing zone corresponding to initial dilutions of 34:1 (D=33) to calculate the total residual chlorine effluent limitation (see Fact Sheet section 4.3.4.2.3). This Order uses a simplified equation from SIP section 1.4 because background concentrations for total residual chlorine are assumed to be zero:

$$ECA = (D+1) * C$$

where:

ECA = Effluent Concentration Allowance (effluent limitation)

C = Water quality objective (0.013 mg/L)

D = Dilution factor (D=33)

This calculation results in a one-hour average effluent limitation of 0.44 mg/L. However, Order R2-2021-0019 established a more stringent effluent limit of 0.43 mg/L using the previous order's dilution factor of 32. This Order retains the total residual chlorine limit of 0.43 mg/L to avoid backsliding.

- 4.3.4.5. **Enterococcus Bacteria.** The enterococcus effluent limitations are based on the *Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California – Part 3, Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality Standards Variance Policy*. This Order establishes a mixing zone associated with an initial dilution of 10:1 (D=9) to calculate the enterococcus effluent limitation (see Fact Sheet section 4.3.4.2.2). To establish background conditions, the Discharger collected two enterococcus receiving water samples near its outfall. The maximum sample result was 4 CFU/100 mL.

The enterococcus effluent limitation was calculated, as specified in SIP section 1.4, using the following equation:

$$ECA = C + D*(C - B)$$

where:

ECA = Effluent Concentration Allowance (effluent limitation)

C = Water quality objective (30 CFU/100 mL, 110 CFU/100mL)

D = Dilution factor (D=9)

B = Background concentration (4 CFU/100 mL)

This calculation results in a six-week rolling geometric mean enterococcus effluent limitation of 260 MPN/100 mL and a limitation of no more than 10 percent of enterococcus samples in a calendar month exceeding 1,100 CFU/100mL.

- 4.3.4.6. **Acute Toxicity.** Until the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, this Order includes effluent limitations for acute toxicity based on Basin Plan Table 4-3.

4.4. Discharge Requirement Considerations

- 4.4.1. **Anti-Backsliding.** This Order complies with the anti-backsliding provisions of CWA sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4), and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l), which generally require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous order. The requirements of this Order are at least as stringent as those in the previous order.

This Order contains new enterococcus bacteria effluent limits based on the *Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California – Part 3, Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality*

Standards Variance Policy. The new effluent limits are expressed using different averaging periods than the previous limits and are therefore not directly comparable.

The previous order included an 11-sample median and 90th percentile effluent limits for acute toxicity based on a monthly monitoring frequency, consistent with Basin Plan Table 4-3. Because this Order establishes a monitoring frequency of once per year, it specifies a three-sample median and single-sample acute toxicity limits, consistent with Basin Plan Table 4-3. The revised acute toxicity effluent limits are more stringent than those from the previous order. On the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, this Order eliminates the acute toxicity effluent limits because the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential for acute toxicity. This is consistent with State Water Board Order WQ 2001-16.

This Order does not retain the previous order's chronic toxicity limits because data no longer indicate reasonable potential for the discharge to cause or contribute to exceedances of the Basin Plan's chronic toxicity water quality objective. This is consistent with State Water Board Order WQ 2001-16.

This Order does not retain the previous order's total coliform limits because Basin Plan Table 4-2A no longer requires total coliform limits for deepwater discharges to protect shellfish harvesting. The previous order's total coliform effluent limits were water-quality based. CWA section 402(o)(1) allows for relaxation of WQBELs if it is consistent with the provisions of CWA section 303(d)(4). CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) applies to this discharge because San Pablo Bay attains the water quality level needed for shellfish harvesting, making it an attainment water. Under CWA section 303(d)(4)(B), a limitation based on a water quality standard or any other permitting standard may only be relaxed where the action is consistent with antidegradation policy. As explained in Fact Sheet section 4.4.2, there will be no degradation to water quality.

- 4.4.2. **Antidegradation.** This Order complies with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16. It does not authorize lowering water quality as compared to the level of discharge authorized in the previous order, which is the baseline by which to measure whether degradation will occur. This Order does not allow for an increased flow, a reduced level of treatment, or increased effluent limitations relative to the previous order. Although this Order modifies the enterococcus bacteria limits, the new limits serve a comparable purpose, reflect the most up-to-date water quality objectives, and will not lower water quality related to bacteria in the receiving waters.

Order R2-2021-0019 replaced the previous order's technology-based effluent limitation for total residual chlorine (0.0 mg/L) with a higher water quality-based effluent limitation (0.43 mg/L) and removed the previous order's technology-

based effluent limit for oil and grease. This Order does not allow degradation in relation to the evaluation made with Order R2 2021-0019.

This Order imposes new aquatic toxicity requirements the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions. The previous order required acute and chronic toxicity monitoring, imposed effluent limits on acute and chronic toxicity, and imposed TRE triggers on chronic toxicity. Before U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, this Order imposes more stringent acute toxicity effluent limits, and continues to impose TRE triggers on chronic toxicity consistent with the previous order. After U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, this Order instead requires chronic toxicity monitoring at the IWC (routine monitoring and MDET and MMET evaluations) and at a waste concentration of 10 percent effluent (surveillance monitoring), which is at least twice the IWC. It also imposes TRE triggers on chronic toxicity at 10 percent effluent and the IWC. The surveillance monitoring and TRE triggers will ensure that a comparable level of treatment will be maintained; thus, these requirements will ensure that receiving water quality will not be degraded. As for the acute toxicity limits, chronic toxicity requirements are protective against acute toxicity, which is caused by higher levels of toxicants. For these reasons, findings authorizing degradation are unnecessary.

The removal of total coliform limits will not degrade water quality because the Discharger must still disinfect bacteria to meet the *Enterococcus* bacteria limits intended to protect water contact recreation. Because *Enterococcus* and total coliform are both indicators for fecal waste, they are removed from wastewater in similar ways. Basin Plan Table 4-2A no longer requires total coliform limits for this deep water discharge because it is positively buoyant in the receiving waters and thus cannot harm benthic organisms like shellfish.

- 4.4.3. **Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.** This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based requirements implement minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains more stringent effluent limitations as necessary to meet water quality standards. Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement CWA requirements.

This Order's WQBELs have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. The beneficial uses and water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that WQBELs were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The procedures for calculating these WQBELs are based on the CTR, as implemented in accordance with the SIP, which U.S. EPA approved on May 18, 2000. U.S. EPA approved most Basin Plan beneficial uses and water quality objectives prior to May 30, 2000. Beneficial uses and water quality objectives

submitted to U.S. EPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by U.S. EPA before that date, are nonetheless “applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA” pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.21(c)(1). U.S. EPA approved the remaining beneficial uses and water quality objectives, so they are also applicable water quality standards pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.21(c)(2).

5. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

The receiving water limitations in sections 5.1 and 5.2 of the Order are based on Basin Plan narrative and numeric water quality objectives. The receiving water limitation in section 5.3 of the Order requires compliance with federal and State water quality standards in accordance with the CWA and regulations adopted thereunder.

6. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

6.1. Standard Provisions

Attachment D contains standard provisions that apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.41 and additional conditions applicable to specific categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.42. The Discharger must comply with these provisions. The conditions set forth in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) apply to all state-issued NPDES permits and must be incorporated into permits either expressly or by reference.

In accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 123.25(a)(12), states may omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. Attachment G contains standard provisions that supplement the provisions in Attachment D. This Order omits the federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the State’s enforcement authority under the Water Code is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates Water Code section 13387(e) by reference.

6.2. Monitoring and Reporting Provisions

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), 122.41(j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code section 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The MRP establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and State requirements. For more information, see Fact Sheet section 7.

6.3. Special Provisions

6.3.1. Reopener Provisions

These provisions are based on 40 C.F.R. sections 122.62 and 122.63 and allow modification of this Order and its effluent limitations as necessary in response to updated water quality objectives, regulations, or other new and relevant information that may become available in the future, and other circumstances as allowed by law.

6.3.2. Effluent Characterization Study and Report

This Order does not include WQBELs for pollutants that do not demonstrate reasonable potential, but this provision requires the Discharger to evaluate monitoring data to verify that the reasonable potential analysis conclusions of this Order remain valid. This requirement is authorized pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(h) and Water Code section 13383, and is necessary to inform the next permit reissuance and to ensure that the Discharger takes timely steps in response to any unanticipated change in effluent quality during the term of this Order.

6.3.3. Pollutant Minimization Program

This provision is based on Basin Plan section 4.13.2 and SIP section 2.4.5.

6.3.4. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works

6.3.4.1. Sludge and Biosolids Management. This provision is based on Basin Plan section 4.17. “Sludge” refers to the solid, semisolid, and liquid residue removed during primary, secondary, and advanced wastewater treatment processes. “Biosolids” refers to sludge that has been treated and may be beneficially reused.

6.3.4.2. Collection System Management. The Discharger’s collection system is part of the Facility regulated through this Order. This provision requires compliance with Attachments D and G and states that these requirements may be satisfied by separately complying with State Water Board Order 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC and any subsequent order updating these requirements. These statewide WDRs require public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with one or more miles of sewer lines to enroll for coverage and comply with requirements to develop sanitary sewer management plans and report sanitary sewer overflows, among other provisions and prohibitions. The statewide WDRs contain requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows that are more extensive and, therefore, more stringent than

the standard provisions in Attachments D and G. Compliance with the statewide WDRs will satisfy the corresponding requirements in Attachments D and G.

6.3.5. Other Special Provisions

- 6.3.5.1. **Copper Action Plan.** This provision is based on Basin Plan section 7.2.1.2 and is necessary to ensure that use of copper site-specific objectives is consistent with antidegradation policies. This Order requires the Discharger to implement source control and pollution prevention for identified sources. Additional actions may be necessary depending on the three-year rolling mean copper concentration in San Pablo Bay. Data the San Francisco Estuary Institute compiled for 2015-2019 indicate no degradation of San Francisco Bay water quality with respect to copper (<https://www.sfei.org/pages/copper-site-specific-objective-3-year-rolling-averages-0>).
- 6.3.5.2. **Cyanide Action Plan.** This provision is based on Basin Plan section 4.7.2.2 and is necessary to ensure that use of cyanide site-specific objectives is consistent with antidegradation policies. The threshold for considering influent cyanide concentrations to indicate a possible “significant cyanide discharge” in the Discharger’s service area is set at 18 µg/L. This concentration is 1.5 times the maximum cyanide concentration (12 µg/L) found in the treatment plant influent during the previous order term.
- 6.3.5.3. **Anaerobically-Digestible Material.** Standard Operating Procedures are required for publicly-owned treatment works that accept hauled waste food, fats, oil, and grease for injection into anaerobic digesters. The development and implementation of Standard Operating Procedures for management of these materials is intended to allow the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to exempt this activity from separate and redundant permitting programs. Some POTWs choose to accept organic material, such as waste food, fats, oils, and grease, into their anaerobic digesters to increase production of methane and other biogases for energy production and to prevent such materials from being discharged into the collection system and potentially causing sanitary sewer overflows. The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery has proposed to exempt publicly-owned treatment works from Process Facility/Transfer Station permit requirements when the same activity is regulated under WDRs or NPDES permits. The proposed exemption is restricted to anaerobically digestible materials that have been prescreened, slurried, processed, and conveyed in a closed system for codigestion with regular sewage sludge. The exemption requires that the publicly-owned treatment works develop Standard Operating Procedures for proper handling, processing, tracking, and management of anaerobically digestible material.

- 6.3.5.4. **Average Annual Selenium Load.** This provision is based on Basin Plan section 7.2.4.5. The information will be used to confirm that selenium loads are consistent with wasteload allocations established in the North San Francisco Bay Selenium TMDL. The requirements regarding treatment of estimated and non-detect values are consistent with the load calculations performed for the TMDL.

7. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements in the MRP.

7.1. Monitoring Requirements Rationale

- 7.1.1. **Influent Monitoring.** Influent flow monitoring is necessary to understand Facility operations and to evaluate compliance with Prohibition 3.4, which prohibits average dry weather influent flow greater than 1.14 MGD. Influent CBOD₅ and TSS monitoring are necessary to evaluate compliance with this Order's 85 percent removal requirement. Basin Plan section 4.7.2.2 requires influent cyanide monitoring because this Order is based on site-specific cyanide water quality objectives.
- 7.1.2. **Effluent Monitoring.** Effluent monitoring at Monitoring Location EFF-001 is necessary to understand Facility operations, evaluate compliance with this Order's effluent limitations, and conduct future reasonable potential analyses.
- 7.1.3. **Toxicity Testing.** Toxicity tests are necessary to ensure the discharge does not cause or contribute to toxicity in the receiving waters, evaluate whether the Toxicity Provisions' chronic toxicity water quality objectives are met, and to conduct future reasonable potential analyses. Chronic toxicity tests are also necessary to evaluate whether Toxicity Reduction Evaluations are needed. This monitoring will allow timely identification and response to potential toxicants.

The Toxicity Provisions require routine monitoring and MDET and MMET evaluations for chronic toxicity at the IWC to ensure that the discharge does not cause or contribute to toxicity in the receiving waters. This Order includes chronic toxicity effluent targets based on Toxicity Provisions section III.C.6 to be implemented after U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions. This Order grants a mixing zone for chronic toxicity corresponding to a dilution ratio of at least 75:1 ($D=74$), equivalent to an IWC of 1.3 percent. The Discharger must evaluate the maximum daily effluent target (MDET) and median monthly effluent target (MMET) based on the IWC. The MMET and MDET are not effluent limits and failing to meet them is not a permit violation; however, failing to meet the MMET or MDET requires accelerated monitoring and potentially a TRE in accordance with MRP section 5.3.3.

Because the discharger's IWC is less than 5 percent effluent, this Order requires surveillance monitoring at an effluent concentration of 10 percent. The Discharger is required to report results for surveillance monitoring at monitoring location SUR-001 instead of EFF-001 to distinguish surveillance monitoring results from monitoring used to evaluate the TRE triggers.

The Discharger conducted quarterly chronic toxicity species sensitive screening tests from July 2021 to May 2022, which satisfies the minimum screening requirements stated in Toxicity Provisions section III.C.2.a.

7.1.4. Receiving Water Monitoring. The Discharger is required to continue participating in the Regional Monitoring Program, which involves collecting data on pollutants and toxicity in San Francisco Bay water, sediment, and biota. This monitoring is necessary to characterize the receiving water and the effects of the discharge this Order authorizes.

7.1.5 Other Monitoring Requirements. Pursuant to CWA section 308, U.S. EPA requires some dischargers to participate in a Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program that evaluates the analytical abilities of laboratories that perform or support NPDES permit-required monitoring. The program applies to discharger laboratories and contract laboratories, and evaluates each laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES program. There are two options to comply: (1) the Discharger may obtain and analyze DMR-QA samples, or (2) pursuant to a waiver U.S. EPA issued to the State Water Board, the Discharger may submit results from the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study. MRP section 1.4 requires the Discharger to ensure that the results of the DMR-QA Study or most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted to the State Water Board, which forwards the results to U.S. EPA.

7.2. Monitoring Requirements Summary. The table below summarizes routine monitoring requirements. This table is for informational purposes only. The actual requirements are specified in the MRP and elsewhere in this Order. In addition to undertaking the monitoring below, the Discharger must conduct receiving water monitoring by continuing to participate in the Regional Monitoring Program.

Table F-11. Monitoring Requirements Summary

| Parameter ^[1] | Influent INF-001 ^[2] | Effluent EFF-001 (or EFF-001D) ^[2] |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Flow | Continuous/D | Continuous/D |
| CBOD | 1/Week | 1/Week |
| TSS | 1/Week | 1/Week |
| pH | - | Continuous/D |
| Chlorine, Total Residual | - | Continuous/H |

| Parameter ^[1] | Influent INF-001 ^[2] | Effluent EFF-001 (or EFF-001D) ^[2] |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Enterococcus Bacteria | - | 3/Week |
| Acute Toxicity | - | 1/Year ^[3] |
| Chronic Toxicity | - | 2/Year |
| Ammonia, Total | - | 1/Month |
| Copper, Total Recoverable | - | 1/Month |
| Cyanide, Total | 2/Year | 1/Month |
| Chlorodibromomethane | - | 2/Year |
| Selenium | - | Once |
| Dioxin-TEQ | - | Once |
| Priority Pollutants | - | Once |

Footnotes:

- ^[1] The Discharger must also comply with the monitoring requirements in the Mercury and PCBs Watershed Permit (NPDES Permit CA0038849) and the Nutrients Watershed Permit (NPDES Permit CA0038873).
- ^[2] The MRP defines these monitoring locations and sampling frequencies.
- ^[3] As of the first day of the month following U.S. EPA approval of the Toxicity Provisions, acute toxicity sampling will no longer be required.

8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Regional Water Board considered the issuance of WDRs that will serve as an NPDES permit for the Facility. As a step in the WDR adoption process, Regional Water Board staff developed tentative WDRs and encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

8.1. Notification of Interested Parties. The Regional Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge, 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](https://waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay) (waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay).

8.2. Written Comments. Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning the tentative WDRs as explained through the notification process. Comments were to be submitted either in person, by e-mail, or by mail to the Executive Office at the Regional Water Board at 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94612, to the attention of Samuel Plummer.

For full staff response and Regional Water Board consideration, the written comments were due at the Regional Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on November 9, 2022.

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

Date: December 14, 2022
Time: 9:00 a.m.

Contact: Samuel Plummer, (510) 622-2485,
Sam.Plummer@waterboards.ca.gov

Interested persons were provided notice of the hearing and information on how to participate. At the public hearing, the Regional Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested to be in writing.

Dates and venues can change. The [Regional Water Board's website](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay) is (waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay), where one can access the current agenda for changes.

- 8.4. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements.** Any person aggrieved by this 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, sections 2050. The State Water Board must receive the petition at the following address within 30 calendar days of the date of 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 water quality petition for review, see the [Water Board's petition instructions](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml) (waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml).

- 8.5. Information and Copying.** The Report of Waste Discharge, related supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the Regional Water Board address above at any time online or by making an appointment with the Regional Water Board's custodian of records. Document copying may be arranged by calling (510) 622-2300.
- 8.6. Register of Interested Persons.** Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional Water Board, reference the Facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.
- 8.7. Additional Information.** Requests for additional information or questions regarding this Order should be directed to Samuel Plummer, (510) 622-2485, Sam.Plummer@waterboards.ca.gov.

**ATTACHMENT G – REGIONAL STANDARD PROVISIONS,
AND MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
(SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D)**

Contents

| | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE | G-2 |
| 1.1. DUTY TO COMPLY – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-2 |
| 1.2. NEED TO HALT OR REDUCE ACTIVITY NOT A DEFENSE – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-2 |
| 1.3. DUTY TO MITIGATE – SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D, PROVISION 1.3. | G-2 |
| 1.4. PROPER OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE – SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D, PROVISION 1.4. | G-3 |
| 1.5. PROPERTY RIGHTS – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-4 |
| 1.6. INSPECTION AND ENTRY – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-4 |
| 1.7. BYPASS – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-4 |
| 1.8. UPSET – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-4 |
| 1.9. OTHER – ADDITION TO ATTACHMENT D | G-4 |
| 2. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-4 |
| 3. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING | G-4 |
| 3.1. SAMPLING AND ANALYSES – SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D, PROVISIONS 3.1 AND 3.2 | G-4 |
| 3.2. STANDARD OBSERVATIONS – ADDITION TO ATTACHMENT D | G-7 |
| 4. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS | G-8 |
| 4.1. RECORDS TO BE MAINTAINED – SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D, PROVISION 4.1 | G-8 |
| 4.2. RECORDS OF MONITORING – SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D, PROVISION 4.2 | G-8 |
| 4.3. CLAIMS OF CONFIDENTIALITY – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-10 |
| 5. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING | G-10 |
| 5.1. DUTY TO PROVIDE INFORMATION – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-10 |
| 5.2. SIGNATORY AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-10 |
| 5.3. MONITORING REPORTS – SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D, PROVISION 5.3 | G-10 |
| 5.4. COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-13 |
| 5.5. TWENTY-FOUR HOUR REPORTING – SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D, PROVISION 5.5 | G-14 |
| 5.6. PLANNED CHANGES – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-16 |
| 5.7. ANTICIPATED NONCOMPLIANCE – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-16 |
| 5.8. OTHER NONCOMPLIANCE – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-16 |
| 5.9. OTHER INFORMATION – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-16 |
| 6. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-16 |
| 7. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS – NOT SUPPLEMENTED | G-16 |
| 8. DEFINITIONS – ADDITION TO ATTACHMENT D | G-16 |

**ATTACHMENT G – REGIONAL STANDARD PROVISIONS,
AND MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
(SUPPLEMENT TO ATTACHMENT D)**

APPLICABILITY

This document supplements the requirements of Federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D). For clarity, these provisions are arranged using to the same headings as those used in Attachment D.

1. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

1.1. Duty to Comply – Not Supplemented

1.2. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense – Not Supplemented

1.3. Duty to Mitigate – Supplement to Attachment D, Provision 1.3.

1.3.1. Contingency Plan. The Discharger shall maintain a Contingency Plan as prudent in accordance with current facility emergency planning. The Contingency Plan shall describe procedures to ensure that existing facilities remain in, or are rapidly returned to, operation in the event of a process failure or emergency incident, such as employee strike, strike by suppliers of chemicals or maintenance services, power outage, vandalism, earthquake, or fire. The Discharger may combine the Contingency Plan and Spill Prevention Plan (see Provision 1.3.2, below) into one document. In accordance with Regional Water Board Resolution No. 74-10, discharge in violation of the permit where the Discharger has failed to develop and implement a Contingency Plan as described below may be the basis for considering the discharge a willful and negligent violation of the permit pursuant to California Water Code section 13387. The Contingency Plan shall, at a minimum, provide for the following:

- 1.3.1.1. Sufficient personnel for continued facility operation and maintenance during employee strikes or strikes against contractors providing services;
- 1.3.1.2. Maintenance of adequate chemicals or other supplies, and spare parts necessary for continued facility operations;
- 1.3.1.3. Emergency standby power;
- 1.3.1.4. Protection against vandalism;
- 1.3.1.5. Expeditious action to repair failures of, or damage to, equipment, including any sewer lines;

- 1.3.1.6. Reporting of spills and discharges of untreated or inadequately treated wastes, including measures taken to clean up the effects of such discharges; and
- 1.3.1.7. Maintenance, replacement, and surveillance of physical condition of equipment and facilities, including any sewer lines.
- 1.3.2. **Spill Prevention Plan.** The Discharger shall maintain a Spill Prevention Plan to prevent accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of any such discharges. The Spill Prevention Plan shall do the following:
 - 1.3.2.1. Identify the possible sources of accidental discharge, untreated or partially-treated waste bypass, and polluted drainage;
 - 1.3.2.2. State when current facilities and procedures became operational and evaluate their effectiveness; and
 - 1.3.2.3. Predict the effectiveness of any proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule with interim and final dates when the proposed facilities and procedures will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

1.4. Proper Operation and Maintenance – Supplement to Attachment D, Provision 1.4

- 1.4.1. **Operation and Maintenance Manual.** The Discharger shall maintain an Operation and Maintenance Manual to provide the plant and regulatory personnel with a source of information describing all equipment, recommended operational strategies, process control monitoring, and maintenance activities. To remain a useful and relevant document, the Operation and Maintenance Manual shall be kept updated to reflect significant changes in treatment facility equipment and operational practices. The Operation and Maintenance Manual shall be maintained in usable condition and be available for reference and use by all relevant personnel and Regional Water Board staff.
- 1.4.2. **Wastewater Facilities Status Report.** The Discharger shall maintain a Wastewater Facilities Status Report and regularly review, revise, or update it, as necessary. This report shall document how the Discharger operates and maintains its wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal facilities to ensure that all facilities are adequately staffed, supervised, financed, operated, maintained, repaired, and upgraded as necessary to provide adequate and reliable transport, treatment, and disposal of all wastewater from both existing and planned future wastewater sources under the Discharger's service responsibilities.
- 1.4.3. **Proper Supervision and Operation of Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs).** POTWs shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing

certificates of appropriate grade pursuant to Title 23, section 3680, of the California Code of Regulations.

1.5. Property Rights – Not Supplemented

1.6. Inspection and Entry – Not Supplemented

1.7. Bypass – Not Supplemented

1.8. Upset – Not Supplemented

1.9. Other – Addition to Attachment D

- 1.9.1. Neither the treatment nor the discharge of pollutants shall create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined by California Water Code section 13050.
- 1.9.2. Collection, treatment, storage, and disposal systems shall be operated in a manner that precludes public contact with wastewater. If public contact with wastewater could reasonably occur on public property, warning signs shall be posted.
- 1.9.3. If the Discharger submits a timely and complete Report of Waste Discharge for permit reissuance, this permit shall continue in force and effect until the permit is reissued or the Regional Water Board rescinds the permit.

2. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION – NOT SUPPLEMENTED

3. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

3.1. Sampling and Analyses – Supplement to Attachment D, Provisions 3.1 and 3.2

- 3.1.1. **Certified Laboratories.** Water and waste analyses shall be performed by a laboratory certified for these analyses in accordance with California Water Code section 13176.
- 3.1.2. **Minimum Levels.** For the 126 priority pollutants, the Discharger should use the analytical methods listed in Table B unless the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP, Attachment E) requires a particular method or minimum level (ML). All monitoring instruments and equipment shall be properly calibrated and maintained to ensure accuracy of measurements.
- 3.1.3. **Monitoring Frequency.** The MRP specifies the minimum sampling and analysis schedule.
 - 3.1.3.1. **Sample Collection Timing**
 - 3.1.3.1.1. The Discharger shall collect influent samples on varying days selected at random and shall not include any plant recirculation or other sidestream

wastes, unless otherwise stipulated in the MRP. The Executive Officer may approve an alternative influent sampling plan if it is representative of plant influent and complies with all other permit requirements.

- 3.1.3.1.2. The Discharger shall collect effluent samples on days coincident with influent sampling, unless otherwise stipulated by the MRP. If influent sampling is not required, the Discharger shall collect effluent samples on varying days selected at random, unless otherwise stipulated in the MRP. The Executive Officer may approve an alternative effluent sampling plan if it is representative of plant discharge and in compliance with all other permit requirements.
- 3.1.3.1.3. The Discharger shall collect effluent grab samples during periods of daytime maximum peak flows (or peak flows through secondary treatment units for facilities that recycle effluent).
- 3.1.3.1.4. Effluent sampling for conventional pollutants shall occur on at least one day of any multiple-day bioassay the MRP requires. During the course of the bioassay, on at least one day, the Discharger shall collect and retain samples of the discharge. In the event that a bioassay result does not comply with effluent limitations, the Discharger shall analyze the retained samples for pollutants that could be toxic to aquatic life and for which it has effluent limitations.
- 3.1.3.1.4.1. The Discharger shall perform bioassays on final effluent samples; when chlorine is used for disinfection, bioassays shall be performed on effluent after chlorination and dechlorination; and
- 3.1.3.1.4.2. The Discharger shall analyze for total ammonia nitrogen and calculate the amount of un ionized ammonia whenever test results fail to meet effluent limitations.

3.1.3.2. **Conditions Triggering Accelerated Monitoring**

- 3.1.3.2.1. **Average Monthly Effluent Limitation Exceedance.** If the results from two consecutive samples of a constituent monitored in a particular month exceed the average monthly effluent limitation for any parameter (or if the required sampling frequency is once per month or less and the monthly sample exceeds the average monthly effluent limitation), the Discharger shall, within 24 hours after the results are received, increase its sampling frequency to daily until the results from the additional sampling show that the parameter complies with the average monthly effluent limitation.
- 3.1.3.2.2. **Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation Exceedance.** If a sample result exceeds a maximum daily effluent limitation, the Discharger shall, within 24 hours after the result is received, increase its sampling frequency to

daily until the results from two samples collected on consecutive days show compliance with the maximum daily effluent limitation.

- 3.1.3.2.3. **Acute Toxicity.** If final or intermediate results of an acute bioassay indicate a violation or threatened violation (e.g., the percentage of surviving test organisms of any single acute bioassay is less than 70 percent), the Discharger shall initiate a new test as soon as practical or as described in applicable State Water Board plan provisions that become effective after adoption of these Regional Standard Provisions. The Discharger shall investigate the cause of the mortalities and report its findings in the next self-monitoring report.
- 3.1.3.2.4. **Chlorine.** The Discharger shall calibrate chlorine residual analyzers against grab samples as frequently as necessary to maintain accurate control and reliable operation. If an effluent violation is detected, the Discharger shall collect grab samples at least every 30 minutes until compliance with the limitation is achieved, unless the Discharger monitors chlorine residual continuously. In such cases, the Discharger shall continue to conduct continuous monitoring.
- 3.1.3.2.5. **Bypass.** Except as indicated below, if a Discharger bypasses any portion of its treatment facility, it shall monitor flows and collect samples at affected discharge points and analyze samples for all constituents with effluent limitations on a daily basis for the duration of the bypass. The Discharger need not accelerate chronic toxicity monitoring. The Discharger also need not collect and analyze samples for mercury, dioxin-TEQ, and PCBs after the first day of the bypass. The Discharger may satisfy the accelerated acute toxicity monitoring requirement by conducting a flow-through test or static renewal test that captures the duration of the bypass (regardless of the method specified in the MRP). If bypassing disinfection units only, the Discharger shall only monitor bacteria indicators daily.
- 3.1.3.2.5.1. **Bypass for Essential Maintenance.** If a Discharger bypasses a treatment unit for essential maintenance pursuant to Attachment D section 1.7.2, the Executive Officer may reduce the accelerated monitoring requirements above if the Discharger (i) monitors effluent at affected discharge points on the first day of the bypass for all constituents with effluent limitations, except chronic toxicity; and (ii) identifies and implements measures to ensure that the bypass will continue to comply with effluent limitations.
- 3.1.3.2.5.2. **Approved Wet Weather Bypasses.** If a Discharger bypasses a treatment unit or permitted outfall during wet weather with Executive Officer approval pursuant to Attachment D section 1.7.4, the Discharger shall monitor flows and collect and retain samples for affected

discharge points on a daily basis for the duration of the bypass. The Discharger shall analyze daily for TSS using 24 hour composites (or more frequent increments) and for bacteria indicators with effluent limitations using grab samples. If TSS exceeds 45 mg/L in any composite sample, the Discharger shall also analyze daily the retained samples for all other constituents with effluent limitations, except oil and grease, mercury, PCBs, dioxin-TEQ, and acute and chronic toxicity. Additionally, at least once each year, the Discharger shall analyze the retained samples for one approved bypass for all other constituents with effluent limitations, except oil and grease, mercury, PCBs, dioxin-TEQ, and acute and chronic toxicity. This monitoring shall be in addition to the minimum monitoring specified in the MRP.

3.2. Standard Observations – Addition to Attachment D

- 3.2.1. **Receiving Water Observations.** The following requirements only apply when the MRP requires standard observations of receiving waters. Standard observations shall include the following:
- 3.2.1.1. **Floating and Suspended Materials (e.g., oil, grease, algae, and other macroscopic particulate matter)** — presence or absence, source, and size of affected area.
 - 3.2.1.2. **Discoloration and Turbidity** — color, source, and size of affected area.
 - 3.2.1.3. **Odor** — presence or absence, characterization, source, and distance of travel.
 - 3.2.1.4. **Beneficial Water Use** — estimated number of water-associated waterfowl or wildlife, fisherpeople, and other recreational activities.
 - 3.2.1.5. **Hydrographic Condition** — time and height of high and low tides (corrected to nearest National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration location for the sampling date and time).
 - 3.2.1.6. **Weather Conditions** — wind direction, air temperature, and total precipitation during five days prior to observation.
- 3.2.2. **Wastewater Effluent Observations.** The following requirements only apply when the MRP requires standard observations of wastewater effluent. Standard observations shall include the following:
- 3.2.2.1. **Floating and Suspended Material of Wastewater Origin** (e.g., oil, grease, algae, and other macroscopic particulate matter) — presence or absence.
 - 3.2.2.2. **Odor** — presence or absence, characterization, source, distance of travel, and wind direction.

3.2.3. **Beach and Shoreline Observations.** The following requirements only apply when the MRP requires standard observations of beaches or shorelines. Standard observations shall include the following:

3.2.3.1. **Material of Wastewater Origin** — presence or absence, description of material, estimated size of affected area, and source.

3.2.3.2. **Beneficial Use** — estimate of number of people participating in recreational water contact, non-water contact, and fishing activities.

3.2.4. **Waste Treatment and/or Disposal Facility Periphery Observations.** The following requirements only apply when the MRP requires standard observations of the periphery of waste treatment or disposal facilities. Standard observations shall include the following:

3.2.4.1. **Odor** — presence or absence, characterization, source, and distance of travel.

3.2.4.2. **Weather Conditions** — wind direction and estimated velocity.

4. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

4.1. Records to be Maintained – Supplement to Attachment D, Provision 4.1

The Discharger shall maintain records in a manner and at a location (e.g., the wastewater treatment plant or the Discharger's offices) such that the records are accessible to Regional Water Board staff. The minimum retention period specified in Attachment D, Provision IV, shall be extended during the course of any unresolved litigation regarding permit-related discharges, or when requested by Regional Water Board or U.S. EPA, Region IX, staff.

A copy of the permit shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel.

4.2. Records of Monitoring – Supplement to Attachment D, Provision 4.2

Monitoring records shall include the following:

4.2.1. **Analytical Information.** Records shall include analytical method detection limits, minimum levels, reporting levels, and related quantification parameters.

4.2.2. **Disinfection Process.** For the disinfection process, records shall include the following:

4.2.2.1. For bacteriological analyses:

4.2.2.1.1. Wastewater flow rate at the time of sample collection; and

- 4.2.2.1.2. Required statistical parameters for cumulative bacterial values (e.g., moving median or geometric mean for the number of samples or sampling period identified in the MRP).
- 4.2.2.2. For the chlorination process (when chlorine is used for disinfection), at least daily average values for the following:
 - 4.2.2.2.1. Chlorine residual of treated wastewater as it enters the chlorine contact basin (mg/L);
 - 4.2.2.2.2. Chlorine dosage (kg/day); and
 - 4.2.2.2.3. Dechlorination chemical dosage (kg/day).
- 4.2.3. **Wastewater Treatment Process Solids.** For each treatment unit process that involves solids removal from the wastewater stream, records shall include the following:
 - 4.2.3.1. Total volume or mass of solids removed from each collection unit (e.g., grit, skimmings, undigested biosolids, or combination) for each calendar month or other time period as appropriate, but not to exceed annually; and
 - 4.2.3.2. Final disposition of such solids (e.g., landfill, other subsequent treatment unit).
- 4.2.4. **Treatment Process Bypasses.** For all treatment process bypasses, including wet weather blending, records shall include the following:
 - 4.2.4.1. Chronological log of treatment process bypasses;
 - 4.2.4.2. Identification of treatment processes bypassed;
 - 4.2.4.3. Beginning and ending dates and times of bypasses;
 - 4.2.4.4. Bypass durations;
 - 4.2.4.5. Estimated bypass volumes; and
 - 4.2.4.6. Description of, or reference to other reports describing, the bypasses, their cause, the corrective actions taken (except for wet weather blending explicitly approved within the permit and in compliance with any related permit conditions), and any additional monitoring conducted.
- 4.2.5. **Treatment Plant Overflows.** The Discharger shall retain a chronological log of overflows at the treatment plant, including the headworks and all units and appurtenances downstream, and records supporting the information provided in accordance with Provision 5.5.2, below.

4.3. Claims of Confidentiality – Not Supplemented

5. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

5.1. Duty to Provide Information – Not Supplemented

5.2. Signatory and Certification Requirements – Not Supplemented

5.3. Monitoring Reports – Supplement to Attachment D, Provision 5.3

5.3.1. Self-Monitoring Reports. For each reporting period established in the MRP, the Discharger shall submit a self-monitoring report to the Regional Water Board in accordance with the requirements listed in the MRP and below:

5.3.1.1. Transmittal Letter. Each self-monitoring report shall be submitted with a transmittal letter that includes the following:

- 5.3.1.1.1. Identification of all violations of effluent limitations or other waste discharge requirements found during the reporting period;
- 5.3.1.1.2. Details regarding the violations, such as parameters, magnitude, test results, frequency, and dates;
- 5.3.1.1.3. Causes of the violations;
- 5.3.1.1.4. Corrective actions taken or planned to resolve violations and prevent recurrences, and dates or time schedules for implementation (the Discharger may refer to previously submitted reports that address the corrective actions);
- 5.3.1.1.5. Explanation for any data invalidation. Data should not be submitted in a self-monitoring report if it does not meet quality assurance/quality control standards. However, if the Discharger wishes to invalidate a measurement after submitting it in a self-monitoring report, the Discharger shall identify the measurement suspected to be invalid and state the Discharger's intent to submit, within 60 days, a formal request to invalidate the measurement. The formal request shall include the original measurement in question, the reason for invalidating the measurement, all relevant documentation that supports invalidation (e.g., laboratory sheet, log entry, test results), and a discussion of the corrective actions taken or planned (with a time schedule for completion) to prevent recurrence of the sampling or measurement problem;
- 5.3.1.1.6. Description of blending, if any. If the Discharger blends, it shall describe the duration of blending events and certify whether the blending complied with all conditions for blending;

- 5.3.1.1.7. Description of other bypasses, if any. If the Discharger bypasses any treatment units (other than blending), it shall describe the duration of the bypasses and effluent quality during those times; and
- 5.3.1.1.8. Signature. The transmittal letter shall be signed in accordance with Attachment D, Provision 5.2.
- 5.3.1.2. **Compliance Evaluation Summary.** Each self-monitoring report shall include a compliance evaluation summary that addresses each parameter for which the permit specifies effluent limitations, the number of samples taken during the monitoring period, and the number of samples that exceed the effluent limitations.
- 5.3.1.3. **More Frequent Monitoring.** If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by the MRP, the Discharger shall include the results of such monitoring in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the self-monitoring report.
- 5.3.1.4. **Analysis Results**
 - 5.3.1.4.1. **Tabulation.** Each self-monitoring report shall include tabulations of all required analyses and observations, including parameters, dates, times, sample stations, types of samples, test results, method detection limits, method minimum levels, and method reporting levels (if applicable), signed by the laboratory director or other responsible official.
 - 5.3.1.4.2. **Multiple Samples.** Unless the MRP specifies otherwise, when determining compliance with effluent limitations (other than instantaneous effluent limitations) and more than one sample result is available, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean. If the data set contains one or more results that are "Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ) or "Not Detected" (ND), the Discharger shall instead compute the median in accordance with the following procedure:
 - 5.3.1.4.2.1. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
 - 5.3.1.4.2.2. The median of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, the median is the average of the two values around the middle, unless one or both of these values is ND or DNQ, in which case the median shall be the lower of the two results (where DNQ is lower than a quantified value and ND is lower than DNQ).

5.3.1.4.3. Duplicate Samples. The Discharger shall report the average of duplicate sample analyses when reporting for a single sample result (or the median if one or more of the duplicates is DNQ or ND [see Provision 5.3.1.4.2, above]). For bacteria indicators, the Discharger shall report the geometric mean of the duplicate analyses.

5.3.1.4.4. Dioxin-TEQ. The Discharger shall report for each dioxin and furan congener the analytical results of effluent monitoring, including the reporting level, the method detection limit, and the measured concentration. The Discharger shall report all measured values of individual congeners, including data qualifiers. When calculating dioxin-TEQ, the Discharger shall set congener concentrations below the minimum levels (MLs) to zero. The Discharger shall calculate and report dioxin-TEQ using the following formula, where the MLs, toxicity equivalency factors (TEFs), and bioaccumulation equivalency factors (BEFs) are as provided in Table A:

$$\text{Dioxin-TEQ} = \sum (C_x \times \text{TEF}_x \times \text{BEF}_x)$$

where: C_x = measured or estimated concentration of congener x

TEF_x = toxicity equivalency factor for congener x

BEF_x = bioaccumulation equivalency factor for congener x

Table A
Minimum Levels, Toxicity Equivalency Factors,
and Bioaccumulation Equivalency Factors

| Dioxin or Furan Congener | Minimum Level (pg/L) | 2005 Toxicity Equivalency Factor (TEF) | Bioaccumulation Equivalency Factor (BEF) |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 2,3,7,8-TCDD | 10 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD | 50 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD | 50 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD | 50 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD | 50 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD | 50 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| OCDD | 100 | 0.0003 | 0.01 |
| 2,3,7,8-TCDF | 10 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF | 50 | 0.03 | 0.2 |
| 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF | 50 | 0.3 | 1.6 |
| 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF | 50 | 0.1 | 0.08 |
| 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF | 50 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF | 50 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF | 50 | 0.1 | 0.7 |
| 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF | 50 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF | 50 | 0.01 | 0.4 |
| OCDF | 100 | 0.0003 | 0.02 |

- 5.3.1.5. **Results Not Yet Available.** The Discharger shall make all reasonable efforts to obtain analytical data for required parameter sampling in a timely manner. Certain analyses may require additional time to complete analytical processes and report results. In these cases, the Discharger shall describe the circumstances in the self-monitoring report and include the data for these parameters and relevant discussions of any violations in the next self-monitoring report due after the results are available.
- 5.3.1.6. **Annual Self-Monitoring Reports.** By the date specified in the MRP, the Discharger shall submit an annual self-monitoring report covering the previous calendar year. The report shall contain the following:
- 5.3.1.6.1. Comprehensive discussion of treatment plant performance, including documentation of any blending or other bypass events, and compliance with the permit. This discussion shall include any corrective actions taken or planned, such as changes to facility equipment or operation practices that may be needed to achieve compliance, and any other actions taken or planned that are intended to improve the performance and reliability of wastewater collection, treatment, or disposal practices;
 - 5.3.1.6.2. List of approved analyses, including the following:
 - 5.3.1.6.2.1. List of analyses for which the Discharger is certified;
 - 5.3.1.6.2.2. List of analyses performed for the Discharger by a separate certified laboratory (copies of reports signed by the laboratory director of that laboratory need not be submitted but shall be retained onsite); and
 - 5.3.1.6.2.3. List of “waived” analyses, as approved;
 - 5.3.1.6.3. Plan view drawing or map showing the Discharger’s facility, flow routing, and sampling and observation station locations; and
 - 5.3.1.6.4. Results of facility report reviews. The Discharger shall regularly review, revise, and update, as necessary, the Operation and Maintenance Manual, Contingency Plan, Spill Prevention Plan, and Wastewater Facilities Status Report so these documents remain useful and relevant to current practices. At a minimum, reviews shall be conducted annually. The Discharger shall describe or summarize its review and evaluation procedures, recommended or planned actions, and estimated time schedule for implementing these actions. The Discharger shall complete changes to these documents to ensure that they remain up-to-date.

5.4. Compliance Schedules – Not supplemented

5.5. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting – Supplement to Attachment D, Provision 5.5

5.5.1. Oil or Other Hazardous Material Spills

- 5.5.1.1. Within 24 hours of becoming aware of a spill of oil or other hazardous material not contained onsite and completely cleaned up, the Discharger shall report as follows:
 - 5.5.1.1.1. If the spill exceeds reportable quantities for hazardous materials listed in 40 C.F.R. part 302. The Discharger shall call the California Office of Emergency Services (800 852-7550).
 - 5.5.1.1.2. If the spill does not exceed reportable quantities for hazardous materials listed in 40 C.F.R., part 302, the Discharger shall call the Regional Water Board (510-622-2369).
- 5.5.1.2. The Discharger shall submit a written report to the Regional Water Board within five working days following either of the above telephone notifications unless directed otherwise by Regional Water Board staff. A report submitted electronically is acceptable. The written report shall include the following:
 - 5.5.1.2.1. Date and time of spill, and duration if known;
 - 5.5.1.2.2. Location of spill (street address or description of location);
 - 5.5.1.2.3. Nature of material spilled;
 - 5.5.1.2.4. Quantity of material spilled;
 - 5.5.1.2.5. Receiving water body affected, if any;
 - 5.5.1.2.6. Cause of spill;
 - 5.5.1.2.7. Estimated size of affected area;
 - 5.5.1.2.8. Observed impacts to receiving waters (e.g., oil sheen, fish kill, water discoloration);
 - 5.5.1.2.9. Corrective actions taken to contain, minimize, or clean up the spill;
 - 5.5.1.2.10. Future corrective actions planned to prevent recurrence, and implementation schedule; and
 - 5.5.1.2.11. Persons or agencies notified.

5.5.2. **Unauthorized Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plant Discharges**¹

5.5.2.1. **Two-Hour Notification.** For any unauthorized discharge that enters a drainage channel or surface water, the Discharger shall, as soon as possible, but not later than two hours after becoming aware of the discharge, notify the California Office of Emergency Services (800-852-7550) and the local health officer or director of environmental health with jurisdiction over the affected water body. Notification shall include the following:

- 5.5.2.1.1. Incident description and cause;
- 5.5.2.1.2. Location of threatened or involved waterways or storm drains;
- 5.5.2.1.3. Date and time that the unauthorized discharge started;
- 5.5.2.1.4. Estimated quantity and duration of the unauthorized discharge (to the extent known), and estimated amount recovered;
- 5.5.2.1.5. Level of treatment prior to discharge (e.g., raw wastewater, primary-treated wastewater, or undisinfected secondary-treated wastewater); and
- 5.5.2.1.6. Identity of person reporting the unauthorized discharge.

5.5.2.2. **Five-Day Written Report.** Within five business days following the two-hour notification, the Discharger shall submit a written report that includes, in addition to the information listed in Provision 5.5.2.1, above, the following:

- 5.5.2.2.1. Methods used to delineate the geographical extent of the unauthorized discharge within receiving waters;
- 5.5.2.2.2. Efforts implemented to minimize public exposure to the unauthorized discharge;
- 5.5.2.2.3. Visual observations of the impacts (if any) noted in the receiving waters (e.g., fish kill, discoloration of receiving water) and extent of sampling if conducted;
- 5.5.2.2.4. Corrective measures taken to minimize the impact of the unauthorized discharge;

¹ California Code of Regulations, Title 23, section 2250(b), defines an unauthorized discharge to be a discharge, not regulated by waste discharge requirements, of treated, partially-treated, or untreated wastewater resulting from the intentional or unintentional diversion of wastewater from a collection, treatment, or disposal system.

- 5.5.2.2.5. Measures to be taken to minimize the potential for a similar unauthorized discharge in the future;
- 5.5.2.2.6. Summary of Spill Prevention Plan or Operation and Maintenance Manual modifications to be made, if necessary, to minimize the potential for future unauthorized discharges; and
- 5.5.2.2.7. Quantity and duration of the unauthorized discharge, and the amount recovered.

5.6. Planned Changes – Not supplemented

5.7. Anticipated Noncompliance – Not supplemented

5.8. Other Noncompliance – Not supplemented

5.9. Other Information – Not supplemented

6. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT – NOT SUPPLEMENTED

7. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS – NOT SUPPLEMENTED

8. DEFINITIONS – ADDITION TO ATTACHMENT D

More definitions can be found in Attachment A of this NPDES Permit.

8.1. Arithmetic Calculations

- 8.1.1. **Geometric Mean.** The antilog of the log mean or the back-transformed mean of the logarithmically transformed variables, which is equivalent to the multiplication of the antilogarithms. The geometric mean can be calculated with either of the following equations:

$$\text{Geometric Mean} = \text{Anti log } (1/N \sum \text{Log } C_i)$$

or

$$\text{Geometric Mean} = (C_1 \times C_2 \times \dots \times C_N)^{1/N}$$

Where “N” is the number of data points for the period analyzed and “C” is the concentration for each of the “N” data points.

- 8.1.2. **Mass Emission Rate.** The rate of discharge expressed in mass. The mass emission rate is obtained from the following calculation for any calendar day:

$$\text{Mass emission rate (lb/day)} = \frac{8.345}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i C_i$$

$$\text{Mass emission rate (kg/day)} = \frac{3.785}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i C_i$$

In which “N” is the number of samples analyzed in any calendar day and “Q” and “C_i” are the flow rate (MGD) and the constituent concentration (mg/L) associated with each of the “N” grab samples that may be taken in any calendar day. If a composite sample is taken, “C_i” is the concentration measured in the composite sample and “Q_i” is the average flow rate occurring during the period over which the samples are composited. The daily concentration of a constituent measured over any calendar day shall be determined from the flow weighted average of the same constituent in the combined waste streams as follows:

$$C_d = \text{Average daily concentration} = \frac{1}{Q_t} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i C_i$$

In which “N” is the number of component waste streams and “Q” and “C” are the flow rate (MGD) and the constituent concentration (mg/L) associated with each of the “N” waste streams. “Q_t” is the total flow rate of the combined waste streams.

- 8.1.3. **Removal Efficiency.** The ratio of pollutants removed by the treatment facilities to pollutants entering the treatment facilities (expressed as a percentage). The Discharger shall determine removal efficiencies using monthly averages (by calendar month unless otherwise specified) of pollutant concentration of influent and effluent samples collected at about the same time and using the following equation (or its equivalent):

$$\text{Removal Efficiency (\%)} = 100 \times [1 - (\text{Effluent Concentration} / \text{Influent Concentration})]$$

- 8.2. **Blending** – the practice of bypassing biological treatment units and recombining the bypass wastewater with biologically-treated wastewater.
- 8.3. **Composite Sample** – a sample composed of individual grab samples collected manually or by an automatic sampling device on the basis of time or flow as specified in the MRP. For flow-based composites, the proportion of each grab sample included in the composite sample shall be within plus or minus five percent (+/-5%) of the representative flow of the waste stream being measured at the time of grab sample collection. Alternatively, equal volume grab samples may be individually analyzed with the flow-weighted average calculated by averaging flow-weighted ratios of each grab sample analytical result. Grab samples comprising time-based composite samples shall be collected at intervals not greater than those specified in the MRP. The quantity of each grab sample comprising a time-

based composite sample shall be a set of flow proportional volumes as specified in the MRP. If a particular time-based or flow-based composite sampling protocol is not specified in the MRP, the Discharger shall determine and implement the most representative protocol.

- 8.4. Duplicate Sample** – a second sample taken from the same source and at the same time as an initial sample (such samples are typically analyzed identically to measure analytical variability).
- 8.5. Grab Sample** – an individual sample collected during a short period not exceeding 15 minutes. Grab samples represent only the condition that exists at the time the sample is collected.
- 8.6. Overflow** – the intentional or unintentional spilling or forcing out of untreated or partially-treated waste from a transport system (e.g., through manholes, at pump stations, or at collection points) upstream of the treatment plant headworks or from any part of a treatment plant.
- 8.7. Priority Pollutants** – those constituents referred to in 40 C.F.R. part 122 as promulgated in the Federal Register, Vol. 65, No. 97, Thursday, May 18, 2000, also known as the California Toxics Rule.
- 8.8. Untreated waste** – raw wastewater.

Table B
List of Monitoring Parameters, Analytical Methods, and Minimum Levels (µg/L)^[1]

| CTR No. | Pollutant / Parameter | Analytical Method ^[2] | GC | GC MS | LC | Color | FAA | GFAA | ICP | ICP MS | SPGF AA | HYD RIDE | CVAA | DCP |
|---------|---|----------------------------------|-----|-------|----|-------|-----|------|-----|--------|---------|----------|------|--------|
| 1 | Antimony | 204.2 | - | - | - | - | 10 | 5 | 50 | 0.5 | 5 | 0.5 | - | 1000 |
| 2 | Arsenic | 206.3 | - | - | - | 20 | - | 2 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | 1000 |
| 3 | Beryllium | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 1 | - | - | 1000 |
| 4 | Cadmium | 200 or 213 | - | - | - | - | 10 | 0.5 | 10 | 0.25 | 0.5 | - | - | 1000 |
| 5a | Chromium (III) | SM 3500 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5b | Chromium (VI) | SM 3500 | - | - | - | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1000 |
| | Chromium (total) ^[3] | SM 3500 | - | - | - | - | 50 | 2 | 10 | 0.5 | 1 | - | - | 1000 |
| 6 | Copper | 200.9 | - | - | - | - | 25 | 5 | 10 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | 1000 |
| 7 | Lead | 200.9 | - | - | - | - | 20 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | 10,000 |
| 8 | Mercury | 1631 ^[4] | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | Nickel | 249.2 | - | - | - | - | 50 | 5 | 20 | 1 | 5 | - | - | 1000 |
| 10 | Selenium | 200.8 or SM 3114B or C | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 1 | - | 1000 |
| 11 | Silver | 272.2 | - | - | - | - | 10 | 1 | 10 | 0.25 | 2 | - | - | 1000 |
| 12 | Thallium | 279.2 | - | - | - | - | 10 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 5 | - | - | 1000 |
| 13 | Zinc | 200 or 289 | - | - | - | - | 20 | - | 20 | 1 | 10 | - | - | - |
| 14 | Cyanide | SM 4500 CN ⁻ C or I | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 15 | Asbestos (only required for dischargers to MUN waters) ^[5] | 100.2 ^[6] | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 16 | 2,3,7,8-TCDD and 17 congeners (Dioxin) | 1613 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | Acrolein | 603 | 2.0 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | Acrylonitrile | 603 | 2.0 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 19 | Benzene | 602 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 33 | Ethylbenzene | 602 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 39 | Toluene | 602 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | Bromoform | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| CTR No. | Pollutant / Parameter | Analytical Method ^[2] | GC | GC MS | LC | Color | FAA | GFAA | ICP | ICP MS | SPGF AA | HYD RIDE | CVAA | DCP |
|---------|--|----------------------------------|-----|-------|----|-------|-----|------|-----|--------|---------|----------|------|-----|
| 21 | Carbon Tetrachloride | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22 | Chlorobenzene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 23 | Chlorodibromomethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 24 | Chloroethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 25 | 2-Chloroethylvinyl Ether | 601 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 26 | Chloroform | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 75 | 1,2-Dichlorobenzene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 76 | 1,3-Dichlorobenzene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 77 | 1,4-Dichlorobenzene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 27 | Dichlorobromomethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 28 | 1,1-Dichloroethane | 601 | 0.5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 29 | 1,2-Dichloroethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 30 | 1,1-Dichloroethylene or 1,1-Dichloroethene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 31 | 1,2-Dichloropropane | 601 | 0.5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 32 | 1,3-Dichloropropylene or 1,3-Dichloropropene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 34 | Methyl Bromide or Bromomethane | 601 | 1.0 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 35 | Methyl Chloride or Chloromethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 36 | Methylene Chloride or Dichloromethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 37 | 1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane | 601 | 0.5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 38 | Tetrachloroethylene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 40 | 1,2-Trans-Dichloroethylene | 601 | 0.5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 41 | 1,1,1-Trichloroethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 42 | 1,1,2-Trichloroethane | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 43 | Trichloroethene | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 44 | Vinyl Chloride | 601 | 0.5 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 45 | 2-Chlorophenol | 604 | 2 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| CTR No. | Pollutant / Parameter | Analytical Method ^[2] | GC | GC MS | LC | Color | FAA | GFAA | ICP | ICP MS | SPGF AA | HYD RIDE | CVAA | DCP |
|---------|--|----------------------------------|----|-------|------|-------|-----|------|-----|--------|---------|----------|------|-----|
| 46 | 2,4-Dichlorophenol | 604 | 1 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 47 | 2,4-Dimethylphenol | 604 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 48 | 2-Methyl-4,6-Dinitrophenol or Dinitro-2-methylphenol | 604 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 49 | 2,4-Dinitrophenol | 604 | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 50 | 2-Nitrophenol | 604 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 51 | 4-Nitrophenol | 604 | 5 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 52 | 3-Methyl-4-Chlorophenol | 604 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 53 | Pentachlorophenol | 604 | 1 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 54 | Phenol | 604 | 1 | 1 | - | 50 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 55 | 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol | 604 | 10 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 56 | Acenaphthene | 610 HPLC | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 57 | Acenaphthylene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 58 | Anthracene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 60 | Benzo(a)Anthracene or 1,2 Benzanthracene | 610 HPLC | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 61 | Benzo(a)Pyrene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 62 | Benzo(b) Fluoranthene or 3,4 Benzofluoranthene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 63 | Benzo(ghi)Perylene | 610 HPLC | - | 5 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 64 | Benzo(k)Fluoranthene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 74 | Dibenzo(a,h)Anthracene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 86 | Fluoranthene | 610 HPLC | 10 | 1 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 87 | Fluorene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 92 | Indeno(1,2,3-cd)Pyrene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 100 | Pyrene | 610 HPLC | - | 10 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 68 | Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate | 606 or 625 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 70 | Butylbenzyl Phthalate | 606 or 625 | 10 | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 79 | Diethyl Phthalate | 606 or 625 | 10 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 80 | Dimethyl Phthalate | 606 or 625 | 10 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 81 | Di-n-Butyl Phthalate | 606 or 625 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| CTR No. | Pollutant / Parameter | Analytical Method ^[2] | GC | GC MS | LC | Color | FAA | GFAA | ICP | ICP MS | SPGF AA | HYD RIDE | CVAA | DCP |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|-----|------|-----|--------|---------|----------|------|-----|
| 84 | Di-n-Octyl Phthalate | 606 or 625 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 59 | Benzidine | 625 | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 65 | Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane | 625 | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 66 | Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether | 625 | 10 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 67 | Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl) Ether | 625 | 10 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 69 | 4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether | 625 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 71 | 2-Chloronaphthalene | 625 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 72 | 4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether | 625 | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 73 | Chrysene | 625 | - | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 78 | 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine | 625 | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 82 | 2,4-Dinitrotoluene | 625 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 83 | 2,6-Dinitrotoluene | 625 | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 85 | 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine ^[7] | 625 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 88 | Hexachlorobenzene | 625 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 89 | Hexachlorobutadiene | 625 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 90 | Hexachlorocyclopentadiene | 625 | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 91 | Hexachloroethane | 625 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 93 | Isophorone | 625 | 10 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 94 | Naphthalene | 625 | 10 | 1 | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 95 | Nitrobenzene | 625 | 10 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 96 | N-Nitrosodimethylamine | 625 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 97 | N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine | 625 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 98 | N-Nitrosodiphenylamine | 625 | 10 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 99 | Phenanthrene | 625 | - | 5 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 101 | 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene | 625 | 1 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 102 | Aldrin | 608 | 0.005 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 103 | α-BHC | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 104 | β-BHC | 608 | 0.005 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 105 | γ-BHC (Lindane) | 608 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 106 | δ-BHC | 608 | 0.005 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| CTR No. | Pollutant / Parameter | Analytical Method ^[2] | GC | GC MS | LC | Color | FAA | GFAA | ICP | ICP MS | SPGF AA | HYD RIDE | CVAA | DCP |
|---------|---|----------------------------------|------|-------|----|-------|-----|------|-----|--------|---------|----------|------|-----|
| 107 | Chlordane | 608 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 108 | 4,4'-DDT | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 109 | 4,4'-DDE | 608 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 110 | 4,4'-DDD | 608 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 111 | Dieldrin | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 112 | Endosulfan (alpha) | 608 | 0.02 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 113 | Endosulfan (beta) | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 114 | Endosulfan Sulfate | 608 | 0.05 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 115 | Endrin | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 116 | Endrin Aldehyde | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 117 | Heptachlor | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 118 | Heptachlor Epoxide | 608 | 0.01 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 119-125 | PCBs: Aroclors 1016, 1221, 1232, 1242, 1248, 1254, 1260 | 608 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 126 | Toxaphene | 608 | 0.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Footnotes:

- ^[1] Minimum levels are from the *State Implementation Policy*. They are the concentration of the lowest calibration standard for that technique based on a survey of contract laboratories. Laboratory techniques are defined as follows: GC = Gas Chromatography; GCMS = Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry; LC = High Pressure Liquid Chromatography; Color = Colorimetric; FAA = Flame Atomic Absorption; GFAA = Graphite Furnace Atomic Absorption; ICP = Inductively Coupled Plasma; ICPMS = Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry; SPGFAA = Stabilized Platform Graphite Furnace Atomic Absorption (i.e., U.S. EPA 200.9); Hydride = Gaseous Hydride Atomic Absorption; CVAA = Cold Vapor Atomic Absorption; DCP = Direct Current Plasma.
- ^[2] The suggested method is the U.S. EPA Method unless otherwise specified (SM = Standard Methods). The Discharger may use another U.S. EPA-approved or recognized method if that method has a level of quantification below the applicable water quality objective. Where no method is suggested, the Discharger has the discretion to use any standard method.
- ^[3] Analysis for total chromium may be substituted for analysis of chromium (III) and chromium (VI) if the concentration measured is below the lowest hexavalent chromium criterion (11 ug/l).
- ^[4] The Discharger shall use ultra-clean sampling (U.S. EPA Method 1669) and ultra-clean analytical methods (U.S. EPA Method 1631) for mercury monitoring. The minimum level for mercury is 2 ng/l (or 0.002 ug/l).
- ^[5] MUN = Municipal and Domestic Supply. This designation, if applicable, is in the Findings of the permit.
- ^[6] Determination of Asbestos Structures over 10 [micrometers] in Length in Drinking Water Using MCE Filters, U.S. EPA 600/R-94-134, June 1994.
- ^[7] Detected as azobenzene.