



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR



MATTHEW RODRIGUEZ
SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

To: Vicky Whitney (sent via email)
Deputy Director for Water Quality
State Water Resources Control Board – Division of Water Quality

From: Bruce H. Wolfe *Naomi L. Wolfe*
Executive Officer *for*
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Date: October 21, 2014

SUBJECT: NON-SUBSTANTIVE CORRECTIONS TO THE AMENDMENT TO INCORPORATE NEW ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM POLICY; AMEND WET WEATHER OVERFLOW POLICY; UPDATE GRAYWATER INFORMATION; AND UPDATE A TABLE OF MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER DISCHARGE LOCATIONS

This memo transmits two non-substantive corrections to the proposed onsite wastewater treatment system policy (OWTS Policy) Basin Plan amendment language (Attachment A) adopted by the San Francisco Bay Water Board in June 2014. The first corrects a California Code of Regulations citation pertaining to graywater standards. The second corrects a typographical error in a single digit of the longitude of the Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin discharge shown in Table 4-8 of the amendment.

Water Board Resolution No. R2-2014-0028 allows the Executive Officer to make such corrections without the need for a Board hearing. Attachment A is the underline/strikeout version of the OWTS Policy Basin Plan amendment which incorporates these non-substantive corrections.

Attachments:

A – OWTS Policy Basin Plan Amendment Underline/Strikeout Text as Adopted by the Regional Board in June 2014 with non-substantive Executive Officer corrections shown in double-strikethrough and double underline format.

ECM#804792

DR. TERRY F. YOUNG, CHAIR | BRUCE H. WOLFE, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

1515 Clay St., Suite 1400, Oakland, CA 94612 | www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay

Language that was proposed for deletion when adopted by the Regional Board through resolution No. R2-2014-0028 is shown in ~~strikeout~~ and added language is underlined. The non-substantive corrections made by the Executive Officer to correct a citation in the CCR for graywater standards and the outfall location for the Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin discharge are shown in ~~double-strikeout~~ and double underline format.

CHAPTER 4 IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

4.9.1 FEDERAL COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW CONTROL POLICY

On April 11, 1994, the U.S. EPA adopted the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Control Policy (50 FR 18688)¹. This policy establishes a consistent national approach for controlling wet weather discharges from ~~CSOs~~ CSS to the nation's water. The policy requires implementation of nine minimum controls that serve as minimum technology-based requirements pursuant to the Clean Water Act. The policy also requires implementation of a long-term control plan that serves as the water quality-based requirements of the Clean Water Act. The long-term control plan must consider the permittee's financial capability and provide for the attainment of water quality standards.

The Water Board applies the policy to the City and County of San Francisco's CSS. San Francisco substantially constructed wet weather control facilities prior to adoption of the CSO Control Policy. Accordingly, since construction was completed in 1997, the Water Board has issued permits to the City and County of San Francisco that require compliance with the provisions of the CSO Control Policy that apply to CSO controls: maintenance of the wet weather facilities to ensure continued maximization of storage and treatment; continued implementation of the nine minimum controls, which constitute the technology-based requirements of the CSO Control Policy; post-construction monitoring to confirm the system's performance; and re-evaluation of the feasibility of reducing or eliminating discharges to sensitive areas.

~~Using the NPDES permit program, the policy initiates a two-phased process with higher priority given to more environmentally sensitive areas. During the first phase, the permittee is required to implement the following 9 Minimum Controls. These constitute the technology-based requirements of the Clean Water Act as applied to combined sewer facilities (best conventional treatment (BCT) and best available treatment (BAT)). These minimum controls can reduce CSOs and their effects on receiving water quality:~~

- ~~(1) Conduct proper operation and regular maintenance programs for the CSS and the CSO outfalls;~~
- ~~(2) Maximize use of the collection system for storage;~~
- ~~(3) Review and modify pretreatment programs to ensure that CSO impacts are minimized;~~
- ~~(4) Maximize flow to the POTW for treatment;~~
- ~~(5) Prohibit CSOs during dry weather;~~
- ~~(6) Control solids and floatable materials in CSOs;~~

¹ A hyperlink to the CSO Control Policy (<http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/cso/cpolicy.cfm>) will be added to the online version of the Basin Plan.

Attachment A: Revised Proposed Basin Plan Amendment

- (7) Develop and implement pollution prevention programs that focus on contaminant reduction activities;
- (8) Notify the public; and
- (9) Monitor to effectively characterize CSO impacts and the efficacy of CSO controls.

Compliance with the minimum controls shall be as soon as practicable, but no later than January 1, 1997. The permittee is also required to initiate development of a long-term control plan to select CSO controls, based on consideration of the permittee's financial capability.

The second phase of the process involves implementation of the long-term control plan developed in the first phase. Such implementation must provide for the attainment of water quality objectives and may result in additional site-specific technology-based controls, as well as water quality-based performance standards that are established based on best professional judgment. While numeric water quality-based effluent limits are not readily established due to unpredictability of a storm event and the general lack of data, the CSO Control Policy requires immediate compliance with water quality standards expressed in the form of a narrative limitation.

The Water Board intends to implement the federal CSO Control Policy for the combined sewer overflows from the City and County of San Francisco. The City and County of San Francisco has substantially completed implementation of the long-term CSO control plan (and is thereby exempted requirements to prepare a long-term control plan).

Additionally, the following is the Water Board's recommended approach to control the seasonal degradation of water quality that results from all wet weather overflows of wastewater, including POTWs with either combined and separate sewer systems, and industrial wastewater facilities. The overflow from San Francisco's combined sewer system is addressed by the CSO Control Policy described above.

4.9.2—CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

The recommended approach to controlling wet weather overflows of wastewater that contains particular characteristics of concern to beneficial uses is a combination of designated alternative levels of maintenance (i.e., combination of treatment levels and beneficial use protection categories) and guidance for the design of overflow discharge structures. The Water Board is not endorsing any specific control measures, but is presenting a conceptual framework that allows for the evaluation of costs and benefits. This framework can be used as guidance in adopting specific control measures. As with all of its programs, the Water Board will implement this conceptual approach consistent with the national goal of "...water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and provides for recreation in and on the water."

Maintenance and associated treatment and overflow requirements are detailed in Table 4-7. The following requirements should be met for all overflows:

- (a) Outfalls achieve an initial dilution of 10:1;
- (b) Overflows receive treatment to remove large visible floatable material and to protect the outfall system; and
- (c) Overflow locations be removed from dead-end sloughs and channels, and from close proximity to beaches and marinas.

Exceptions to (a) and (c) will be considered where an inordinate burden would be placed on the discharger relative to beneficial uses protected, and when an equivalent level of environmental protection can be achieved by alternative means, such as an alternative discharge site, a higher level of treatment, and/or improved treatment reliability.

The conceptual approach described above will be used by the Water Board in evaluating wet weather discharge conditions where polluted stormwater or process wastewater bypasses any treatment unit or units that are used in the normal treatment of the waste stream. Evaluation of such discharges must include identification of:

- Actual capacities of the collection system, each treatment unit, and the disposal system;
- Flow return period probabilities for the specific facility location;
- Cost of providing complete storage or treatment capacity and disposal capacity for flow return periods of 1, 5, and 20 years;
- Quality of the polluted stormwater and process wastewater for flow return periods of 1, 5, and 20, years; and
- Beneficial uses that may be affected by such discharges.

4.9.32 SURFACE IMPOUNDMENT OVERFLOW PROTECTION

Note: Section 4.9.3 would be renumbered to Section 4.9.2 because of the proposed deletion of Section 4.9.2. The text in Section 4.9.3 would be retained unchanged. Table 4.7 will be deleted as part of this amendment

Table 4-7: Controlling Wet-weather Overflows

Levels of Water Quality Protection	Appropriate Level of Treatment
Complete protection for areas where the aquatic environment should be free of any identifiable risk from the discharge of untreated waste (i.e., shellfish beds for year-round harvesting)	Maintenance Level A: Secondary treatment up to 20-year recurrence interval; above 20-year overflows allowed
Areas that do not need complete year-round protection, such as shellfish beds for dry-weather harvesting, public beaches, and other water contact areas	Maintenance Level B: Secondary treatment for all flows up to two-year recurrence interval; primary treatment up to 20-year recurrence interval; above 20-year overflows allowed
Areas where water quality or aquatic productivity may be limited due to the pollution effects of a dense human population or other urban activities that are largely uncontrollable. Such areas may include some shipyards and harbors	Maintenance Level C: Secondary treatment to half year recurrence interval; primary treatment to five-year recurrence interval; above five-year overflows allowed

4.11.1 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

The City and County of San Francisco owns and operates the only combined sewer system in the San Francisco Bay Region. ~~collects the wastewater in a San Francisco's combined sewer system.~~ That is, the domestic sewage, industrial wastewater, and stormwater runoff are ~~all~~ collected in

the same pipes and treated at one of two all-weather secondary treatment plants – the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant and the Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant – or at the North Point Wet Weather Facility. (combined sewer). Such system is subject to overloading during severe storms. Most other communities in California have a separated sewer system: one set of pipes for domestic sewage and industrial wastes and another set for stormwater. The system was designed and constructed with several features intended to minimize combined sewer overflows. First, the system has a peak wet weather treatment capacity significantly in excess of dry weather flows. Second, the system design includes more than 200 million gallons of wet weather storage in large transport/storage (T/S) structures that surround San Francisco. These T/S structures hold back the wet weather flows generated by most storms until they can be routed to the treatment plants. During large storms, wet weather flows consisting mostly of stormwater are discharged through one of thirty-six permitted combined sewer discharge (CSD) outfalls. The T/S structures also include baffles and weirs to hold back solids and floating debris prior to discharge through a CSD outfall.

San Francisco was one of the first municipalities in the nation to complete construction of comprehensive combined sewer overflow controls is near completion of the primary components of its wastewater facilities master plan. This construction program began in 1974 with the publication of the Master Plan Environmental Impact Statement and Report, jointly issued by San Francisco and the U.S. EPA, which described an. The integrated wastewater control system established by the master plan has been designed to provide control and treatment for both dry weather sewage and wet weather storm flows, and to achieve long-term average CSD frequencies mandated by the Water Board to protect beneficial uses. All dry weather flows currently receive secondary level treatment. At program completion in 1996, all wet weather flows including stormwater runoff will be captured and will receive a specified level of treatment depending on the size of the storm. Pollutant removal from stormwater will be approximately 60 percent system wide (measured as reduction in total suspended solids). San Francisco is one of the first municipalities in the nation to complete a comprehensive control program for a combined sewer system. The program was fully implemented in 1997 at a cost of approximately \$2 billion. The expenditures for completing the wastewater master plan is about \$1.45 billion. The Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant is a major component of San Francisco's wastewater treatment system. The plant provides secondary level treatment for all dry weather domestic and industrial wastewater from the Bayside drainage area in San Francisco (approximately 75 percent of the total citywide flow). The Oceanside plant provides similar treatment on the Westside. The storage/transport around the periphery of the city store combined sewage for treatment after the storms subside. Additionally, northeast zone storm flows receive treatment at the Northpoint wet weather treatment plant.

4.18 ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPERSAL SYSTEMS

As the population of the Region increases, demand for new development increases. In many cases, new development is within areas served by municipal sewer systems. However, development is also occurring in outlying areas not served by existing sewerage agencies. In those instances, new discrete sewerage systems are being proposed. These are primarily onsite wastewater treatment and dispersal systems (onsite systems or septic systems) serving individual homes, but include community systems serving multiple residences. Today there more than 110,000 onsite systems throughout the Region, and approximately 1,000 new systems are approved each year.

In response to these development pressures, the Water Board adopted a Policy on Discrete Sewerage Facilities in 1978 (Board Resolution No. 78-14). The Policy set forth guiding regulatory principles and the actions ~~that~~ the Water Board will ~~would~~ take with respect to proposals for individual or community sewerage systems serving new development. The 1978 Policy was rescinded in 2014 when the State Water Board's statewide Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS Policy) was incorporated by reference into the Basin Plan (section 4.18.2) but relevant guiding principles and requirements from the 1978 Policy have been retained in section 4.18.1 to complement the OWTS Policy. An important provision of the policy required the development of guidelines for acceptable onsite system practices. The Water Board's policy and guidelines are presented below.

4.18.1 POLICY ON DISCRETE SEWERAGE FACILITIES

~~This~~ The Water Board will apply ~~policy enumerates~~ the following guiding principles, which apply to all wastewater discharges from discrete sewerage systems:

- The system must be designed and constructed so as to be capable of preventing pollution or contamination of the waters of the state or creating nuisance ~~for the life of the development;~~
- The system must be operated, maintained, and monitored so as to continually prevent pollution or contamination of the waters of the state and the creation of a nuisance;
- ~~The responsibility for both of the above must be clearly and legally assumed by a public entity with the financial and legal capability to assure that the system provides protection to the quality of the waters of the state for the life of the development.~~

~~The policy also makes the following requests of city and county governments:~~

- ~~That the use of new discrete sewerage systems be prohibited where existing community sewerage systems are reasonably available;~~
- ~~That the use of individual onsite systems for any subdivision of land be prohibited unless the governing body having jurisdiction determines that the use of the systems is in the best public interest and that the existing quality of the waters of the state is maintained consistent with the State Water Board's [Resolution 68-16](#); and~~
- ~~That the cumulative impacts of individual system discharges be considered as part of the approval process for development.~~

~~Finally, the policy also requires that a public entity assume legal authority and responsibility for new community wastewater treatment and dispersal systems.~~

The Water Board requires an assessment of the cumulative impact of discharges from individual wastewater treatment and disposal systems on water quality and public health where the density of systems or geologic conditions are such that adverse impacts may occur. This assessment shall be included in the application submitted to local agencies for systems covered by the OWTS Policy conditional waiver or, if not covered by the conditional waiver, in the Report of Waste Discharge submitted to the Water Board.

The Water Board also requires that a public entity must assume legal authority and responsibility for the planning, design, financing, construction, operation, and maintenance of any new community wastewater treatment and dispersal system. Community systems are defined as

collection sewers plus treatment facilities serving multiple discharges under separate ownership, such as small, pre-engineered and prefabricated packaged wastewater treatment plants or common septic tanks plus dispersal facilities. The responsible public entity must prepare acceptable operation, maintenance, revenue, and contingency plans for the wastewater treatment and dispersal facility. These plans shall be included in the application submitted to local agencies for systems covered by the OWTS Policy conditional waiver or, if not covered by the conditional waiver, in the Report of Waste Discharge submitted to the Water Board. In the absence of acceptable plans, the discharge will be prohibited.

~~The policy requires local governments, during the development approval process, to consider either the formation of a new government entity or an existing public entity to assume this responsibility.~~

4.18.2 ONSITE WASTEWATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

The Water Board prohibits the discharge of wastes which threaten to cause water pollution, water quality degradation, or the creation of health hazards or nuisance condition. Requirements for siting, design, operation, maintenance, and management of onsite wastewater treatment systems are specified in the State Water Board's OWTS Policy. The OWTS Policy, including future revisions, is incorporated into this Basin Plan and shall be implemented according to the policy's provisions.

The OWTS Policy sets forth a tiered implementation program with requirements based upon levels (tiers) of potential threat to water quality. The OWTS Policy applies to: individual treatment and dispersal systems; community collection, treatment, and dispersal systems; and alternative collection, treatment, and dispersal systems that use subsurface dispersal. The OWTS Policy only applies to such systems with a projected flow of 10,000 gallons per day or less of domestic wastewater and, in some cases, high strength wastewater (not exceeding 900 mg/L BOD) from commercial food service buildings equipped with a properly sized and functioning oil/grease interceptor.

The OWTS Policy includes a conditional waiver of waste discharge requirements for onsite systems that are in conformance with the policy. Onsite wastewater treatment systems that do not meet the applicability criteria of the OWTS Policy or whose wastewater does not meet the quantity and quality specifications of the policy cannot receive coverage under the conditional waiver so these systems will be regulated by the Water Board through other regulatory means.

4.18.2 ONSITE SYSTEM GUIDELINES

~~Since the early 1960s, the Water Board, pursuant to Section 13296 of the Water Code, adopted waivers for reporting certain septic system discharges in all the Region's counties except San Francisco. In its policy, the Water Board required the development of individual system guidelines concentrating mainly on septic systems. These guidelines provided information on system design and construction, operation and maintenance, and the conduct of cumulative impact studies.~~

~~In 1979, the Water Board adopted [Resolution No. 79-5: Minimum Guidelines for the Control of Individual Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems \(Minimum Guidelines\)](#). These guidelines include recommended practices for onsite system design, construction, operation and maintenance, and cumulative impact assessments, along with supporting rationale. The guidelines focus on the most common and conventional type of onsite systems, a septic tank followed by~~

gravity flow discharges into a subsurface soil absorption system, but underlying principles remain applicable to all types of onsite systems.

~~4.18.3 ALTERNATIVE ON-SITE SYSTEMS~~

~~The conventional onsite system, when properly constructed and operated, has long been a reliable and acceptable method of providing onsite sewage management. However, there are widespread conditions throughout the Region that preclude the use of conventional systems, including high groundwater, shallow or poor quality soil, or steep slopes. In recent years, there has been active interest and research in the development of alternative methods of onsite wastewater management to accommodate these limiting conditions. Alternative methods currently in use include additional treatment prior to soil discharge such as by a sand filter, or improved methods of dispersal into native soil such as by pressurized distribution throughout the soil absorption system, or via an engineered above-grade mound unit.~~

~~While alternative methods can afford improved practices, the use of alternative systems is not without limitations. The site and soil conditions that preclude conventional practices remain and must be appropriately addressed, since all onsite systems ultimately rely on soil absorption of all or most of the wastewater generated. Most alternative systems require a high degree of design expertise, which increases the danger of faulty design or installation and complicates the review of various proposals. Furthermore, given that alternative systems are primarily used in areas of existing site or soil limitations, in the event of failure, options for replacement will be few, and corrections difficult to achieve. Finally, most alternative systems require a far more intensive and sophisticated level of management than conventional systems, including inspection, monitoring and maintenance by qualified service providers, and increased regulatory oversight, as well as careful use and operation by the homeowner.~~

~~Recognizing the need for a position on alternative systems, the Water Board adopted the following statement in the 1979 Minimum Guidelines:~~

~~"The Water Board Executive Officer may authorize the Health Officer to approve alternative systems when all of the following conditions are met:~~

- ~~a. Where the Health Officer has approved the system pursuant to criteria approved by the Water Board Executive Officer;~~
- ~~b. Where the Health Officer has informed the Water Board Executive Officer of the proposal to use the alternative system and the finding made in (a) above; and~~
- ~~c. Where a public entity assumes responsibility of the inspection, monitoring and enforcing the maintenance of the system through:
 - ~~i. Provision of the commitment and the necessary legal powers to inspect, monitor, and when necessary to abate/repair the system; and~~
 - ~~ii. Provision of a program for funding to accomplish (i) above."~~~~

~~The fundamental point is that the Water Board will allow the use of alternative systems only if adequate design review, system management, and means for failure correction are assured, and a county or some other public agency assumes ultimate responsibility for these actions.~~

~~The Water Board may authorize local agencies to approve and permit alternative on-site systems, provided the local regulatory program is found to be acceptable and in accordance with the Water Board's position on alternative systems discussed above. An acceptable program should include~~

Attachment A: Revised Proposed Basin Plan Amendment

~~a) siting and design criteria for the types of alternative systems being approved, b) procedures for on-going inspection, monitoring, and evaluation of these systems, and c) appropriate local regulations for implementation and enforcement of the program. Authorization may be granted through a conditional waiver adopted by the Water Board and will typically include a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Water Board and the local agency. Typically, that agency will be the county environmental health department. The MOU provides a means for identifying the responsibilities of both the Water Board and the local agency, applicable criteria for siting, design, construction, operation, maintenance and monitoring, and procedures for implementing the program.~~

~~Alternative onsite system designs proposed for approval in a local agency program should be substantiated by suitable reference materials demonstrating successful performance under site and soil conditions similar to the local conditions, including previous field or research facility testing and documentation of applicable design, installation and use criteria. System designs that have not been fully proven under proposed conditions will be considered experimental and treated with caution. In general, experimental systems will require more careful siting and design review and, if approved, intensive monitoring and inspection to ensure adequate system operation and performance. Experimental systems are generally approved only for limited use, until successful performance has been demonstrated and documented, and acceptable design, installation and use criteria determined.~~

4.18.4 GRAYWATER SYSTEMS

Graywater systems are a ~~special group type~~ of onsite systems that are used to manage only isolated domestic wastewaters that have not come in contact with toilet wastes. In ~~1997-2009~~, the California Building Standards Commission approved revised California Graywater Standards (Graywater Standards). These standards developed by the California Department of Housing and Community Development ~~Water Resources (DWR)~~, are codified at Title 24, CCR, Part 5, Chapter 16A, part I Appendix G, and apply to all graywater systems statewide.

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 17922.12, “graywater” means untreated wastewater that has not been contaminated by any toilet discharge, has not been affected by infectious, contaminated, or unhealthy bodily wastes, and does not present a threat from contamination by unhealthful processing, manufacturing, or operating wastes. “Graywater” includes, but is not limited to, wastewater from bathtubs, showers, bathroom washbasins, clothes washing machines, and laundry tubs, but does not include wastewater from kitchen sinks or dishwashers.

The Graywater Standards specify the means by which graywater ~~certain non-toilet wastewaters~~ may be collected, filtered, and used either in irrigation systems or, if treated, certain indoor uses, discharged into onsite subsurface irrigation systems. Allowable sources of graywater include showers, tubs, bathroom sinks and laundry water. Discharged graywater may only be used for subsurface landscape irrigation. The standards apply to both residential and commercial buildings. The Graywater Standards promote water conservation by facilitating re-use of laundry, shower, lavatory and similar sources of discharge for irrigation and/or indoor use. These revised standards allow certain types of systems to be installed without a building permit.

Cities and counties have authority to develop policies and procedures for the implementation of graywater programs. In developing these, consultation with the Water Board and local water districts can ensure that potential impacts on local water quality are taken into consideration.

CHAPTER 5: PLANS AND POLICIES

5.1 STATE WATER BOARD PLANS AND POLICIES

Add the following language at the end of section 5.1, right before section 5.2

WATER QUALITY CONTROL POLICY FOR SITING, DESIGN, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS (OWTS POLICY)

The Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS Policy), Resolution No. 2012-0032, was adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on June 19, 2012. This Policy implements California Water Code, Chapter 4.5, Division 7, sections 13290-13291.7, and establishes statewide regulations and standards for permitting and operation of onsite wastewater systems. The OWTS Policy specifies criteria for existing and new onsite systems and establishes a conditional waiver of waste discharge requirements for onsite systems that comply with the policy.

5.2.7 ONSITE WASTE DISPERSAL AND WASTE DISCHARGE

The Water Board's policy on small waste discharge systems has evolved considerably as the Bay Area has become more developed. The following section summarizes a series of resolutions regarding conditions under which the Water Board would either object to or prohibit specific activities involving small waste discharge systems. ~~would waive waste discharge reporting requirements. Generally, this waiver is only granted when a county or other government entity has an active permitting and monitoring program comparable to the Water Board's.~~

SEPTIC, LEACHING, AND SMALL COMMUNITY SYSTEMS—RESOLUTION NO. 81 (1951)

This resolution stated the Water Board's objection to the construction and use of wells for septic effluent disposal or street runoff, except when such wells discharge into geologic formations that at no time contained water suitable for domestic, agricultural, or industrial use.

~~WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT TO REPORT WASTE DISCHARGE FOR SYSTEMS REGULATED BY COUNTY AND LOCAL AGENCIES~~

~~In 1963 and 1964, the Water Board waived its regulatory authority over waste discharge reporting for family dwellings using discrete systems, as long as they were already regulated by local health departments and met certain conditions. In the same resolutions, the Water Board also urged local planning and legislative bodies to require connection to sewer systems for all new development whenever feasible. Resolutions were adopted for Alameda County (No. 512; 1963), Contra Costa County (No. 583; 1964), Napa County (No. 596; 1964), San Mateo County (No. 597; 1964), Solano County (No. 598; 1964), Sonoma County (No. 599; 1964), and Santa Clara County (No. 600; 1964). The Solano County waiver (Res. 598) was later amended by Resolution No. 75-12 in 1975, which indicated that the waiver would not apply to planned unit development with minimum lot sizes smaller than 2.5 acres and by Resolution 83-1 (1983).~~

The Water Board's general policy on discrete sewerage facilities was later amended by Resolution Nos. 78-14 (1978) and 79-5 (1979). The first described specific actions that would be

Attachment A: Revised Proposed Basin Plan Amendment

~~taken by the Water Board when it was presented with a proposal for new discrete sewerage systems and what specific requests it would make of local governments. In 79-5, the Water Board set minimum guidelines for determining the adequacy of local ordinances for controlling individual wastewater treatment and disposal systems.~~

~~In 1980, the Water Board (Resolution No. 80-9) requested that the County of Alameda correct deficiencies in its individual waste treatment and disposal systems program, acting under policies adopted in the Alameda County waiver (Res. 512) and discrete sewerage policies (Res. 78-14 and 79-5). In 1981, the Water Board rescinded Resolution No. 597 and reissued a policy (Resolution No. 81-9) on waiving reporting of discharges from individual wastewater treatment and disposal systems in San Mateo County. The Contra Costa County Waiver was amended in 1983 (Res. 83-2), and the Marin County Waiver in 1984 (Res. 84-12).~~

~~CITY OF NOVATO — RESOLUTION NO. 87-155~~

~~In this resolution, the Water Board stated its policy regarding a waiver of waste discharge reporting requirements from individual wastewater treatment systems in the City of Novato.~~

*In Chapter 5, in the **Section 5.2.11 Wetlands***

USE OF WASTEWATER TO CREATE, RESTORE, AND ENHANCE MARSHLANDS — RESOLUTION NOS. ~~77-1~~ AND 94-086

UPDATES TO TABLE 4-8

Table 4-8: Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)

POTW Facility Discharger Name	POTW Outfall Location ^a	Number of Outfalls	Flow ^b (MGD)	Treatment Level ^c	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Comment
City of American Canyon	1	<u>2</u>	2.5	Advanced <u>Secondary</u>	38 11 14 <u>38.1879</u> <u>38.1849</u>	122 16 27 <u>122.2771</u> <u>122.2791</u>	
City of Benicia	2	<u>1</u>	4.5	Secondary	38 02 30 <u>38.0417</u>	122 09 03 <u>122.1508</u>	
City of Burlingame	3	<u>1</u>	5.5	Secondary	37 39 55 <u>37.6653</u>	122 21 44 <u>122.3614</u>	Discharges through North Bayside System Unit outfall
City of Calistoga	4	<u>2</u>	0.84	Advanced <u>Secondary</u>	38 33 34 <u>38.5594</u> <u>38.5703</u>	122 33 28 <u>122.5578</u> <u>122.5611</u>	With dry weather reclamation seasonal discharge restrictions apply
Central Contra Costa Sanitary District	5	<u>1</u>	53.8	Secondary	38 02 44 <u>38.0456</u>	122 05 55 <u>122.0986</u>	
Central Marin Sanitation Agency	6	<u>1</u>	10	Secondary	37 56 54 <u>37.9483</u>	122 27 23 <u>122.4564</u>	
Contra Costa Co. Sanitary District No. 5	7	<u>1</u>	0.025 <u>0.033</u>	Secondary	38 02 55 <u>38.0486</u>	122 10 56 <u>122.1822</u>	
Delta Diablo Sanitary District	8	<u>1</u>	16.5	Secondary	38 01 40 <u>38.0278</u>	121 50 14 <u>121.8372</u>	
<u>Dublin San Ramon Services District</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>Secondary</u>			<u>Discharges to EBDA outfall</u>
East Bay Dischargers Authority (EBDA) ^d	9	<u>1</u>	77.1 <u>79.1</u>	Secondary	37 41 40 <u>37.6944</u>	122 17 42 <u>122.2950</u>	Common outfall for EBDA and LAVWMA
• City of Hayward			<u>18.5</u>	Secondary			EBDA member (16.5 mgd)
• Oro Loma Sanitary District			<u>20</u>	Secondary			EBDA member (20 mgd)
• City of San Leandro			<u>7.6</u>	Secondary			EBDA member (7.6 mgd)
• Union Sanitary District			<u>33</u>	Secondary			EBDA member (33 mgd)
East Bay Municipal Utility District	10	<u>1</u>	120	Secondary	37 49 02 <u>37.81722</u>	122 20 55 <u>122.3486</u>	

Attachment A: Revised Proposed Basin Plan Amendment

POTW Facility Discharger Name	POTW Outfall Location^a	Number of Outfalls	Flow^b (MGD)	Treatment Level^c	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Comment
Fairfield Suisun Sewer District	11	<u>4</u>	<u>47.5-23.7</u>	Advanced Secondary	<u>38-12-33</u> <u>38.2092</u> <u>38.2144</u> <u>38.2097</u> <u>38.2333</u>	<u>422-03-24</u> <u>122.0567</u> <u>122.0656</u> <u>122.0581</u> <u>122.0589</u>	With dry weather reclamation seasonal discharge restrictions apply
Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	12	<u>2</u>	2.92	Secondary	<u>38-01-32</u> <u>38.0253</u> <u>38.0269</u>	<u>422-30-58</u> <u>122.5169</u> <u>122.5133</u>	seasonal discharge restrictions apply
Livermore-Amador Valley Waste Management Agency (LAVWMA)	9		20	Secondary	<u>37-41-40</u>	<u>422-17-42</u>	Discharge to EBDA outfall
• Dublin/San Ramon Sanitary District			47	Secondary			LAVWMA member (11.5 mgd)
City of Livermore	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	8.5	Secondary			LAVWMA member (5.25 mgd) Discharges to EBDA outfall
Marin County Sanitary District No. 5 (Tiburon Wastewater Treatment Plant)	13	<u>1</u>	0.98	Secondary	<u>37-52-12</u> <u>37.8700</u>	<u>412-27-05</u> <u>122.4514</u>	Shares outfall with the Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin
Marin County Sanitary District No. 5 (Paradise Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant)	Not shown on Figure 4-1	<u>1</u>	<u>0.04</u>	Secondary	<u>37.8972</u>	<u>122.4611</u>	
City of Millbrae	3	<u>1</u>	3.0	Secondary	<u>37-39-55</u> <u>37.6653</u>	<u>422-21-41</u> <u>122.3614</u>	Discharges through North Bayside System Unit outfall
Mt. Mountain View Sanitary District	14	<u>1</u>	<u>2.4</u> <u>3.2</u>	Advanced Secondary	<u>38-01-12</u> <u>38.0211</u>	<u>422-05-47</u> <u>122.1036</u>	
Napa Sanitary Sanitation District	15	<u>1</u>	15.4	Advanced Secondary (filtration for reclamation)	<u>38-14-09</u> <u>38.2358</u>	<u>422-17-10</u> <u>122.2861</u>	With dry weather reclamation seasonal discharge restrictions apply
North San Mateo County Sanitation District	16	<u>1</u>	8.0	Secondary	<u>37-42-48</u> <u>37.7133</u>	<u>422-30-50</u> <u>122.5139</u>	
Novato Sanitary District	17	<u>1</u>	<u>6.55</u> <u>7.05</u>	Secondary	<u>39-04-00</u> <u>38.0600</u>	<u>422-29-00</u> <u>122.4900</u>	seasonal discharge restrictions apply
City of Pacifica	18	<u>1</u>	<u>3.3</u> <u>4</u>	Advanced Secondary	<u>37-36-53</u> <u>37.6147</u>	<u>422-29-16</u> <u>122.4878</u>	

Attachment A: Revised Proposed Basin Plan Amendment

POTW Facility Discharger Name	POTW Outfall Location^a	Number of Outfalls	Flow^b (MGD)	Treatment Level^c	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Comment
City of Palo Alto	19	<u>2</u>	39	Advanced <u>Secondary</u>	37 27 11 <u>37.4583</u> <u>37.4417</u>	122 06 36 <u>122.1103</u> <u>122.1125</u>	
City of Petaluma	20	<u>1</u>	5.2 <u>6.7</u>	Secondary	38 12 33 <u>38.2092</u>	122 34 22 <u>122.5728</u>	With dry weather reclamation seasonal discharge restrictions apply
Cities <u>City of Pinole & Hercules</u>	21	<u>1</u>	4.06 <u>3.52</u>	Secondary	38 03 06 <u>38.0517</u>	122 15 55 <u>122.2700</u>	Share outfall with Rodeo Sanitary District
Rodeo Sanitary District	21	<u>1</u>	1.14	Secondary	38 03 06 <u>38.0517</u>	122 15 55 <u>122.2700</u>	Shares outfall with City of Pinole/Hercules
City & County of San Francisco, Southeast	22	<u>4</u>	85.4 <u>84.5</u>	Secondary	37 44 58 <u>37.7494</u> <u>37.7472</u> <u>37.8069</u> <u>37.8100</u>	122 22 22 <u>122.3728</u> <u>122.3869</u> <u>122.4031</u> <u>122.4056</u>	
City & County of San Francisco, Oceanside	23	<u>1</u>	43	Secondary	37 42 18 <u>37.7050</u>	122 34 39 <u>122.5775</u>	
City & County of San Francisco, International Airport	3	<u>1</u>	2.2	Secondary	37 39 55 <u>37.6653</u>	122 21 41 <u>122.3614</u>	Discharges through North Bayside System Unit outfall
San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant	24	<u>1</u>	167	Advanced <u>Secondary</u>	37 26 06 <u>37.4398</u>	121 57 08 <u>121.9581</u>	
<u>City of San Mateo and City of Foster City Estero Municipal Improvement District</u>	25	<u>1</u>	13.6 <u>15.7</u>	Advanced <u>Secondary</u>	37 34 50 <u>37.5806</u>	122 14 45 <u>122.2458</u>	
Sausalito-Marin City Sanitary District	26	<u>1</u>	1.8	Secondary	37 50 37 <u>37.8433</u>	122 28 03 <u>122.4761</u>	
Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside	27	<u>1</u>	4.0	Secondary	37 28 23 <u>37.4731</u>	122 27 00 <u>122.4500</u>	
Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin	13	<u>1</u>	3.6	Secondary	37 52 12 <u>37.8700</u>	121 27 05 <u>122.4514</u>	Shares outfall with Marin County Sanitary District No. 5 (Tiburon Wastewater Treatment Plant)

Attachment A: Revised Proposed Basin Plan Amendment

POTW Facility Discharger Name	POTW Outfall Location^a	Number of Outfalls	Flow^b (MGD)	Treatment Level^c	Discharge Point Latitude	Discharge Point Longitude	Comment
South Bayside System Authority Silicon Valley Clean Water	29	<u>1</u>	29	Advanced Secondary	37.33.48 <u>37.5644</u>	122.12.55 <u>122.2172</u>	
Sonoma Valley County Sanitary District	28	<u>5</u>	3.0	Secondary	38.14.14 <u>38.2372</u> <u>38.2183</u> <u>38.2189</u> <u>38.2036</u> <u>38.2052</u>	122.25.51 <u>122.4319</u> <u>122.3833</u> <u>122.3904</u> <u>122.3314</u> <u>122.3320</u>	With dry weather reclamation seasonal discharge restrictions apply
Cities of South San Francisco and San Bruno Water Quality Control Plant	3	<u>1</u>	13	Secondary	37.39.55 <u>37.6653</u>	122.21.41 <u>122.3614</u>	Discharges through North Bayside System Unit outfall
City of St. Helena	30	<u>1</u>	0.5	Secondary	38.30.10 <u>38.5028</u>	122.26.15 <u>122.4375</u>	With dry weather reclamation seasonal discharge restrictions apply
City of Sunnyvale	31	<u>1</u>	29.5	Advanced Secondary	37.26.00 <u>37.4203</u>	122.02.00 <u>122.0167</u>	
U.S. Navy Treasure Island	32	<u>1</u>	2.0	Secondary	37.49.50 <u>37.8306</u>	122.21.25 <u>122.3569</u>	As part of base closure will be transferred to City & Co. of S.F.
Vallejo Sanitation & Flood Control District	33	<u>2</u>	15.5	Secondary	38.03.53 <u>38.0897</u> <u>38.0647</u>	122.13.42 <u>122.2533</u> <u>122.2283</u>	With dry weather reclamation
West County Agency (WCA)	34	<u>1</u>	28.5	Secondary	37.54.47 <u>37.9631</u>	122.25.06 <u>122.4183</u>	WCA common outfall
• City of Richmond			<u>16</u>	Secondary			WCA member (16 mgd)
• West County Wastewater District			<u>12.5</u>	Secondary			WCA member (12.5 mgd)
Town of Yountville	35	<u>1</u>	0.55	Secondary	38.24.30 <u>38.4061</u>	122.20.25 <u>122.4922</u>	With dry weather reclamation seasonal discharge restrictions apply

NOTES:

- Figure 4-1 shows corresponding outfall locations. For facilities with multiple discharge points, the main outfall is listed first.
- Dry weather average design flow as identified in ~~current~~ permits. MGD = million gallons per day.
- This column indicates the level of treatment. Advanced secondary treatment includes, at a minimum, filtration.
- The combined dry weather average design flow discharged from the EBDA outfall is 107.8 MGD. This flow is a combination of flows from EBDA member agencies and flows from the Livermore Amador Valley Water Management Agency pipeline, which carries flows from the City of Livermore and the Dublin/San Ramon Services District.