RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

On

Draft Regional Board Order No. R8-2018-0001

NPDES Permit No. CAG018001

General Waste Discharge Requirements for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (Dairies and Related Facilities) within the Santa Ana Region

For the comment period beginning July 23, 2018 and ending August 30, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Commenter(s)</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Commenter asserts that the mention of excreted pharmaceuticals and metabolites in Finding 3 is an inflammatory statement and that significant evidence must be produced to make this statement. It was in prior year drafts and removed because of lack of local watershed evidence. Use of pharmaceuticals is currently very restricted and limited to veterinary applications in the hospital area of dairy. This comment should be removed.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff believes that Finding 3 is well supported by an extensive body of scientific research. The statement is currently supported by a reference to a literature review conducted by the USEPA, which was published in 2013 and another study by the USEPA published in 2004. The literature review involved examination of over 300 government and academic studies of dairy wastes. We will further reinforce Finding 3 with additional literature that is more geographically relevant. The reinforcing literature includes Watanabe et al 2010 and Watanabe et al 2008 which studied dairies in northern San Joaquin Valley. The literature also includes Zhen et al 2008 which studied a dairy in the San Jacinto Valley. All of these studies are referenced in USEPA's 2013 literature review. Regional Board staff has also modified Finding 3 to state that CAFO's &quot;may contain&quot; the indicated pollutants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The commenter requests that Finding 3 be amended to state that the Regional Board finds that AFOs with specified populations &quot;are a potential contributor&quot; of pollutants as opposed to a &quot;significant contributor&quot;.</td>
<td>40 CFR section 122.23(c) specifies that the appropriate authority may designate any AFO as a CAFO &quot;upon determining that it is a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States&quot;. Finding 3 represents the Regional Board's determination and is appropriately worded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The commenter requests clarification that Finding 6 applies to new facilities as entirely new dairies, not change of ownership or modification of an existing dairy.</td>
<td>The commenter's interpretation of Finding 6 is correct. We will modify Finding 6 to make this clearer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The commenter notes that previous permits have automatically enrolled dairies if they were already covered in the previous permit. Finding 9 indicates that existing dairies will have to submit Notices of Intent in order to obtain authorization to discharge under the new Order. This requirement should be rejected and restored to previous language.</td>
<td>USEPA has rejected automatic enrollment as being inconsistent with Federal requirements in 40 CFR section 122.23(h). Regional Board staff is committed to methods to reduce the regulatory burden of the dischargers in submitting NOIs. We are open to holding enrollment workshops, using pre-printed forms, and other methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Typographic error in Finding 10.</td>
<td>The error has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The commenter requests that Finding 11 be rewritten. The commenter understands the intent behind the Finding after discussion and agrees that the existing EWMP should be used.</td>
<td>Finding 11 has been modified to clarify the intent behind it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Typographic error in Finding 16.</td>
<td>The error has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Provision II.A.4. excludes the reference to the CAL/EPA Emergency Animal Disease Regulatory Guidance for Disposal and Decontamination (October 20, 204). This reference should be reinstated.</td>
<td>USEPA has rejected the reference as being contradictory to the Effluent Limitation Guidelines in 40 CFR Part 412. The referenced Regulatory Guidance in Provision II.A.4. does not have the weight of regulation. It was included in the previous permit language because it provides limited instruction in the event of a mass mortality event. It does not supersede federal, state, or local requirements and it does not provide instruction on how to resolve conflicts among regulatory agencies. While the reference may provide the dairy industry comfort that regulatory flexibility may be available under a State of Emergency, the reference raises more questions than it answers and ultimately is not practical by itself. There are animal emergency programs, such as those run by Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service at the US Department of Agriculture and the California Animal Response Emergency System run by the California Department of Food and Agriculture. It is not practical or necessary to provide a full accounting of these and other programs in this Order to explain how regulatory conflicts will be resolved under a State of Emergency. Excluding the reference does not negate the existence of any animal emergency programs. There is no harm in excluding the reference and the benefit of its inclusion is minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>Provision II.A.12. should have a corollary requirement for the San Jacinto Basin that prohibits manure from outside of the Basin from being applied inside the Basin.</td>
<td>The recommended prohibition is not necessary. Provision II.A.13 already restricts the application of manure to land that overlies groundwater management zones that lack assimilative capacity unless a plan is being developed and implemented that ultimately offsets the effects of the land applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The language in Provision II.A.13. should be the same as what is in the current permit. The proposed language implies a &quot;guilty until proven innocent&quot; approach which should be &quot;innocent until proven guilty&quot;.</td>
<td>The salt offset program referenced in Provision II.A.13. is currently embodied in the Work Plan, the San Jacinto Watershed Integrated Regional Dairy Management Plan (IRDMP), and the Salt Offset Options Report. Regional Board staff has not performed an evaluation of the programs and projects represented in these documents to independently determine if the necessary salt offsets are being achieved. According to the Fact Sheet for the current permit, we have relied on unspecified reports from the Dischargers. Regional Board staff will amend the language to be consistent with the current permit's Provision II.A.14. and an &quot;innocent until proven guilty&quot; approach as recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The commenter believes that the intent behind Provision III.A.1. is not clear and requests clarification.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff has modified the language of Provision III.A.1. for clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The commenter indicates that &quot;must&quot; should be changed to &quot;shall&quot; in Provision III.B.1.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff believes that &quot;must&quot; is the most appropriate term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The commenter objects to the wording of Provision IV.A.3.a. regarding level markers for containment structures.</td>
<td>Based on discussions with attendees at a permit workshop held on August 21, 2018, Regional Board staff’s understanding of the objection is that an individual marker cannot indicate the available capacity of a system of containment structures. In some cases, changes in operation of the system, such as during maintenance, will invalidate the indicators on a marker. Regional Board staff agrees and we have changed the language to reflect that that a combination of markers must indicate the minimum capacity. However, the language indicating the runoff volume from the 25-year, 24-hour storm event should remain. This is the volume specified in the Effluent Limitation Guidelines in 40 CFR Part 412.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The commenter requests that a check box be added to the annual report forms to facilitate compliance with Provision IV.A.3.b.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff has made the recommended change to the annual report form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The referenced provision in Provision IV.A.4. is incorrect.</td>
<td>The reference has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Provision IV.A.5. should refer to “effective measures” instead of “effective program”.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff has made the recommended change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Provision IV.A.6. should change “must” to “should” and explain what an “emergency outlet” is.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff believes that “must” is the most appropriate term. We have inserted examples of specific types of emergency outlets to better explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author and Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Changes Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>Provision IV.B.1. should change &quot;must&quot; to &quot;will&quot; implement and change &quot;effective programs&quot; to &quot;effective measures&quot;.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff believes that &quot;must&quot; is the most appropriate term. We have changed the language to &quot;effective measures&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>Provision IV.B.2. should specify that Dischargers must &quot;implement effective measures&quot; instead of &quot;have an effective program&quot;.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff has made the recommended change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>References to Title 27 have been omitted in the permit provisions and should be included.</td>
<td>The reference to Title 27 has been placed in Provision IV.C.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The referenced provision in Provision IV.C.8.g. is incorrect.</td>
<td>The reference has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>There is a typographical error in Provision IV.D.1.</td>
<td>The error has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Section/Provision</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>The commenter objects to the requirements of Section IV.G.1. The requirement to submit letters of permission is redundant and unnecessary. Manure data is available through the manure manifests, through Riverside County NOIs, and through the CWAD. The purpose of Section IV.G.1. is to improve the Regional Board's ability to track the discharge of salt in manure applications overlying the groundwater management zones in California. Staff in other regions have expressed a need for this information. Some pieces of information, such as quantities of manure, are available in the manure manifests, but the location information is not sufficiently precise. Data collected as part of the program surrounding the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Agricultural Dischargers (CWAD) and in other region's non-point source programs for agricultural waste discharges can provide the areas for locations where manure is spread. The letters of permission will relate these pieces of information. The commenter appears to refer to Riverside County Ordinance 427. Regional Board staff has reviewed Ordinance 427 and finds that it contains sufficient information to satisfy the purpose of Section IV.G.1. In order to minimize redundancy, the Section will be modified so that valid exemptions, issued by the Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner pursuant to Ordinance 427, are also acceptable. We will also eliminate the need for letters of permission where manure is exported out of the state. Letters are not needed for manure transported to composting or bagging facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>The monitoring report required by Provision IV.H.1.a. is achieved through the Middle Santa Ana River TMDL Task Force. This will be acknowledged, but not required, in the Provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>In Provision IV.H.1.b., &quot;conclusively&quot; should be substituted with &quot;adequately&quot;. Regional Board staff has elected to delete the term &quot;conclusively&quot; instead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>The use of &quot;or&quot; in Provision IV.H.1.d. would place an unfair burden on the Dischargers if water quality objectives are not being obtained but the Dischargers are in compliance with their waste load allocation. Regional Board staff agrees. &quot;Or&quot; has been changed to &quot;and&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>The waste load allocation under Provision IV.H.1.f. is not complete and does not include temporary suspensions. Language that includes the temporary suspension of the wet-weather waste load allocation has been added in the revised draft permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The there is an error in the bullets for Section IV.H.1.</td>
<td>The error has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The evaluation required in Section IV.I.2. is being performed by the Chino Basin Watermaster under the Optimum Basin Management Program. It should be removed and replaced with a discussion about these efforts.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff disagrees. Although we acknowledge the collective efforts of stakeholders under the Optimum Basin Management Program, these requirements are intended to continue to motivate the Dischargers to participate in monitoring work regarding the impacts of dairy facilities on underlying groundwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The monitoring report required by Provision IV.J.3. is achieved through the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL Task Force.</td>
<td>This will be acknowledged, but not required, in the Provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>“Conclusively” should be replaced by “adequately” in Provision IV.J.3.b.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff has elected to delete the term “conclusively” instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The use of “or” in Provision IV.J.3.d. would place an unfair burden on the Dischargers if water quality objectives are not being obtained but the Dischargers are in compliance with their waste load allocation.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff agrees. “Or” has been changed to “and”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author on behalf of</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Amendment/Deletion Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Section IV.J.3.</td>
<td>should be amended to authorize the Dischargers to use an approve offset program to demonstrate compliance with the waste load allocations in the nutrient TMDL for Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake. This is necessary to address loads that occur during extreme wet weather (greater than the 25-year, 24-hour event) since there is no feasible method of preventing such discharges from dairies. The commenter cites language from Order No. R8-2013-0017 as an example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>The requirement in Provision X.A.3.d. of the Monitoring and Reporting Program is not consistent with the rest of the permit. The current annual report and manure manifests require acknowledging that the sample results were provided to manure recipient, but those results are never part of the dairy’s file at RWQCB. There are also privacy concerns.</td>
<td>Provision X.A.3.d. (Section XI in the revised draft) requires that the Dischargers’ Annual Report include the results of sampling and analysis of surface discharges and manure. This is not a new requirement; it is found in Provision X.A.3.b. of the Monitoring and Reporting Program of the current permit. It does not create any new privacy concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Provision X.A.3.e. of the Monitoring and Reporting Program creates a privacy concern.</td>
<td>Provision X.A.3.e. (Section XI in the revised draft) requires Dischargers to include “confirmation that written permission from agricultural operators or landowners of cropland where the Discharger’s manure is applied is valid and in full effect” in their annual report. Regional Board staff anticipates that this confirmation can be indicated with a check box in the annual report form. Checking this box will not disclose any private information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Provision X.A.3.g. of the Monitoring and Reporting Program should be deleted.</td>
<td>Provision X.A.3.g. (Section XI in the revised draft) duplicates part of the requirement of Provision X.A.3.e. It has been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer’s Council</td>
<td>Provision X.B. of the Monitoring and Reporting Program should be deleted. The referenced program was never implemented due to lack of funding.</td>
<td>Provision X.B. has been deleted. A correction to the lettered bulleted language has also been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The Annual Report Form should allow the Discharger to mark 'not applicable' in response to questions on Nutrient Management Plans.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff agrees. The option has been provided in the revised form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The question in the Annual Report Form on the nutrient analysis of hauled manure should follow the question on hauled manure.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff agrees. The question has been moved in the revised form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The commenter asks if manure reaching a regional treatment facility then leaves the state?</td>
<td>This depends on the disposal methods used by the facility operator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>The manure destination options in the Manure Tracking Manifest Form should include an option for ‘out of state’.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff agrees. The option has been provided in the revised form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>8/25/2018</td>
<td>Pat Boldt on behalf of Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition and the Milk Producer's Council</td>
<td>There is a formatting error on page 2 of the Notice of Intent Form.</td>
<td>The error has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>There is an issue with the first sentence.</td>
<td>The error has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Finding K, paragraph 26 should cite 40 CFR section 122.44 not just subsection (a). The latter portion of the paragraph falls under 40 CFR section 122.44(b).</td>
<td>The citation has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Finding L cites 40 CFR section 122.44(k)(3) when it should cite both (3) and (4).</td>
<td>The citation has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The commenter recommends that the Regional Board require electronic reporting and increase visual monitoring. There currently are no electronic management systems to accommodate electronic reporting at this time. An effort to develop those systems is being carried out by the State Water Resources Control Board. Provisions X.A.2. and X.A.3. allow the Regional Board to require electronic reporting when those systems are in place. Except for daily visual monitoring of water lines, the visual monitoring requirements of the draft permit are consistent with those required under 40 CFR section 412.37(a). Daily monitoring of water lines has been added to the Monitoring and Reporting Program. We have also added requirements to document corrections of deficiencies and explanations for any delayed corrections. The commenter has not provided a basis to require increased visual monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The commenter incorporates their comments made in a letter dated December 18, 2017. The comments in the December 18, 2017 letter will be addressed later in this response to comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The draft permit’s requirements for electronic reporting conflict with the electronic reporting requirements in 40 CFR section 122.41(l), requiring electronic reporting by December 21, 2016 and with 40 CFR sections 127.11(a) and 127.16(a). The commenter is correct. The State Water Resources Control Board is currently developing an electronic reporting system to remedy these federal requirements. The Regional Board does not control the project schedule for this effort. Therefore it would not be prudent to establish a deadline in the permit language. Instead, as described in our response to comment 2.4, we have established conditional electronic reporting requirements. Noticing the permittees about the upcoming federal electronic reporting requirement on December 21, 2020 through language in the permit is imprudent. The reporting system could be ready before then or shortly afterwards; the readiness of the system should dictate the timing and intensity of Regional Board staff’s outreach efforts. The permittees have been placed on notice of the pending requirements through workshops held in April and August 2018. Regional Board staff anticipates participating in additional workshops with permittees to facilitate the process as the electronic reporting system approaches readiness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The permit should be revised to require weekly inspections of wastewater conveyances and containment structures and storm water diversion structures; daily inspections of water lines; and weekly inspections of wastewater containment structures. See the response to comment 2.4 above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The weekly checklist, Form 1, does not comply with the requirements for daily inspections of water lines according to 40 CFR section 412.37(a)(1)(ii). Regional Board staff is not providing forms for daily inspections of water lines largely due to the administrative burden of distributing, collecting, and storing documents covering 365 observations by operators of over 100 facilities. The federal regulations do not require that the Regional Board perform this work. Instead, 40 CFR section 412.37(b) places this burden on the permittee. The revised draft permit is consistent with this requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The instructions in Form 1 to perform daily inspections are narrower in scope than what is required by the federal regulations at 40 CFR sections 412.37(a)(1)(i) and (iii). Modifications have been made to Form 1 to more closely reflect the scope of weekly inspections required by the federal regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Suggested Action</td>
<td>Regional Board Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>8/30/2018</td>
<td>Colin Kelly, Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Requirements in 40 CFR section 412.4(c)(4) to periodically inspect equipment used for land application of manure, litter, or process wastewater pursuant to a nutrient management plan should be in the body of the permit.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff believes that inspection requirements are best located in the Monitoring and Reporting Program. We have revised the Monitoring and Reporting Program to include the periodic inspection requirements for operators subject to a Nutrient Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The commenter urges the Regional Board to draft a strong permit to protect the watershed.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff believes that this permit is protective of the watershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The permit must require dairies to electronically submit reports and data; require permittees to monitor ground and surface water; monitor specific harmful unregulated pollutants; regularly update nutrient management plans and engineered waste management plans; prepare emergency plans; visually monitor more frequently; and call the Regional Board when there are unanticipated discharges.</td>
<td>The comment summarizes comments made later in the commenter’s letter. The comment addresses multiple issues that are addressed as the more detailed comments are presented. See the responses to the detailed comments below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The permit should require permittees to submit all reports electronically to a searchable and publicly-accessible database.</td>
<td>See the responses to comments 2.4 and 2.6 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12/19/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The permit should require groundwater and surface water monitoring to ensure compliance and effectiveness.</td>
<td>Provision IV.H.1. requires surface water monitoring for pathogens in the Chino Basin. Provision IV.J.1. requires groundwater monitoring in the San Jacinto River Basin. Provision II of the Monitoring and Reporting Program requires monitoring of discharges to surface waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proponent's Position</td>
<td>Regional Board's Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The permit should require monitoring for harmful unregulated pollutants, specifically antimicrobials and hormones.</td>
<td>As indicated in Finding 3, the Regional Board recognizes that CECs may be found in dairy waste. The commenter recognizes that the Regional Board currently has a non-regulatory program for CECs which involves monitoring for certain indicators. This work is largely carried out by water and wastewater agencies since pumped groundwater will ultimately pass through their treatment plants before being supplied to industrial, agricultural and residential users. In the Chino Basin, dairy wastewater will have a diminishing role in transporting CECs to waters of the state as the industry leaves the Region. In both the Chino Basin and the San Jacinto Basin, permittees are required to participate in groundwater monitoring programs but are not required to monitor CECs in their wastewater. CECs have been shown to be present in at least some dairy wastewater and in groundwater. However, the toxicological relevance or, more generally, the impacts to beneficial uses, is not known. The commenter has not demonstrated the additional value of monitoring by the permittees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Permittees should be required to regularly update Engineered Waste Management Plans and Nutrient Management Plans.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff disagrees. Permittees should update their Engineered Waste Management Plans and Nutrient Management Plans when necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Permittees should be required to prepare emergency response plans in the event of facility infrastructure failure.</td>
<td>The commenter has not demonstrated the benefit of emergency response plans. In the event of a catastrophic failure of an above-grade waste containment structure, several acre-feet of wastewater might be rapidly released into the public right-of-way or onto adjacent property. Typical dairies are not staffed with enough personnel to respond to such an event and would have to rely on professional emergency personnel summoned through 911. In cases where there is a threatened uncontrolled release, such as a leak through a rodent burrow or through a blocked or damaged overflow, a typical dairy operator will use a front end loader or skip loader to plug leaks or clear blockages. These responses were commonly observed by Regional Board staff prior to implementation of Engineered Waste Management Plans (these instances are less common since then) and do not warrant a separate emergency response plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Permittees should be required to monitor more frequently to reduce or eliminate preventable discharges. The commenter recommends the monitoring schedule from the North Coast Region.</td>
<td>The visual monitoring schedule in the draft permit comes from the USEPA's Effluent Limitations Guidelines. These limitations are applicable to dairies nationwide. The Santa Ana Region generally has rainfall intensities and frequencies that are less than most areas of the nation. The monitoring schedule in the draft permit is commensurate with the climate of the Santa Ana Region and an increased schedule is not justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>Permittees should be required to call the Office of Emergency Services upon discharge and the Regional Board once the dairy is back in compliance with the permit.</td>
<td>Provision III.A.6. requires direct notification to the Regional Board in the event of anticipated noncompliance. Notification within 24 hours is required where an instance of noncompliance endangers public health or the environment. This notification does not obviate the need to call 911. The commenter does not indicate the benefit of requiring Dischargers to also notify the Office of Emergency Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>The new permit should delete language that is repetitive or unnecessary. The new permit should directly and explicitly incorporate all substantive provision in the attachments into the body of the permit.</td>
<td>Provision III.A.6. requires direct notification to the Regional Board in the event of anticipated noncompliance. Notification within 24 hours is required where an instance of noncompliance endangers public health or the environment. This notification does not obviate the need to call 911. The commenter does not indicate the benefit of requiring Dischargers to also notify the Office of Emergency Services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>The Monitoring and Reporting Program should be incorporated into the permit.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff undertook a review of the structure of the permit with the commenter’s objectives in mind. The attachments are comprised of the Standard Provisions, the Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Fact Sheet, and other forms. The Standard Provisions are generally applicable to all NPDES permits and are organized appropriately. The Monitoring and Reporting Program of the current permit contained important Effluent Limitations Guidelines. Many of these were relocated to the body of the permit. The contents of the Fact Sheet and the forms are appropriately organized. The commenter has not pointed out additional specific improvements that could be made to the draft permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>A consolidated list of documents required for an annual report should be provided in a section within the permit.</td>
<td>The list is provided in the Monitoring and Reporting Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>A section for record keeping should be provided that lists all documents that the permittees are required to maintain on site.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff agrees. A list has been provided in the Monitoring and Reporting Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>Regional Board staff undertook a review of the structure of the permit with the commenter’s objectives in mind. The attachments are comprised of the Standard Provisions, the Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Fact Sheet, and other forms. The Standard Provisions are generally applicable to all NPDES permits and are organized appropriately. The Monitoring and Reporting Program of the current permit contained important Effluent Limitations Guidelines. Many of these were relocated to the body of the permit. The contents of the Fact Sheet and the forms are appropriately organized. The commenter has not pointed out additional specific improvements that could be made to the draft permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic, Vermont Law School, on behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper</td>
<td>The permit should clearly indicate the permittees' compliance duties and the Regional Board's supervisory and enforcement obligations.</td>
<td>Regional Board staff believes that the draft permit does this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region
3737 Main Street, Suite 500, Riverside, California 92501-3348
Phone (951) 782-4130 FAX (951) 781-6288 TDD (951) 782-3221
www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana

DRAFT ORDER NO. R8-2018-0001
NPDES PERMIT NO. CAG018001

GENERAL WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS (DAIRIES AND RELATED FACILITIES) WITHIN THE SANTA ANA REGION

Dischargers described below, who have complied with the requirements for coverage under this Order, are authorized to discharge wastes once permit coverage is effective, subject to the waste discharge requirements set forth in this Order:

| Dischargers | Persons discharging dairy wastes or other similar kinds of wastes from an existing dairy or related facility to waters of the United States in any manner that may affect water quality are hereinafter referred to as “Dischargers” and may obtain coverage under this Order. Persons discharging wastes from other types of animal feeding operations must obtain coverage under a separate general permit or individual waste discharge requirements. Persons discharging wastes from a proposed or newly-constructed dairy or related facility must obtain coverage under individual waste discharge requirements |

This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on: September 7, 2018
This Order shall become effective on: December 16, 2018
This Order shall expire on: December 15, 2023

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this Order shall supersede Order No. R8-2013-0001 except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Dischargers shall comply with the requirements in this Order.
I, Hope A. Smythe, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, on September 7, 2018.

Hope A. Smythe, Executive Officer
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I. FINDINGS

A. CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS AND NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM PERMIT

1. Section 502 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) defines concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) as point source discharges. All discharges of pollutants from point sources to waters of the U.S. should be regulated under an NPDES permit. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1342, 1362(14). Discharges of wastes from CAFOs within the region are currently regulated under a General NPDES permit, Order No. R8-2013-0001, adopted by the Regional Board on June 7, 2013. Order No. R8-2013-0001 expired on June 6, 2018 but was administratively continued pursuant to Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations section 2235.4 and 40 C.F.R. § 122.6. Order No. R8-2018-0001 renews the expired permit.

B. DISCHARGE INFORMATION

2. An animal feeding operation (AFO) is considered a CAFO based on either a facility’s animal population or if it is determined to be a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States by the appropriate authority, regardless of population. 40 C.F.R. § 122.23(b)(4) and (6). The wastes generated by CAFOs are manure that the animals excrete, process wastewater (primarily wash water from the milk barn) and storm water runoff from manured areas. Approximately 10% of the manure that a milking cow excretes each day is excreted while in the milk barn, and approximately 90% of the manure excreted from the animals is deposited in the corrals. CAFO owners/operators scrape and remove manure from the corrals generally twice per year. The average moisture content of manure when it is removed from the corrals is 33% (all the manure numbers used in this Order refer to manure with 33% moisture content). In 2017, CAFOs removed approximately 186,000 tons of manure from their corrals in the region. This is equivalent to approximately 431,000 cubic yards of manure.

3. Wastes produced at CAFOs contain pathogens, biochemical oxygen demand (an indicator of biodegradable materials), ammonia, nitrate, phosphorus, excreted pharmaceuticals and their metabolites, metals, and other salt...
compounds. Unless properly managed, these wastes could adversely impact the quality of receiving waters (both surface and groundwaters). Discharges of waste from CAFOs within the region could adversely impact water quality in the Santa Ana River, the San Jacinto River, and their tributaries. Impaired waterbodies located within these watersheds include Lake Elsinore, Canyon Lake, and Santa Ana River, Reach 3; Mill Creek (Prado Area); and Chino Creek, Reaches 1A, 1B, 2. As such, it is critical to regulate the discharge of wastes from all significant sources of pollutants to these waterbodies. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board), as the designated authority, has determined that all AFOs with a herd size of more than 20 dry or milking cows or 50 heifers, calves, or cattle within the Santa Ana Region are a significant potential contributor of pollutants to waters of the U.S. As such, these facilities must be regulated under waste discharge requirements.

4. There are currently 109 dairy and dairy-related CAFOs within the Santa Ana Region. These CAFOs include dairies, heifer ranches and calf nurseries. As of December 31, 2017, these CAFOs contained approximately 126,000 animals. This population is comprised of 67,000 milking cows, 11,400 dry cows, 31,500 heifers (12 to 18-month-old cows), 13,000 calves (less than 12-month-old cows), and 3,100 other animals (beef cows, horses, bulls, etc.). Eighty-Four (84) of these facilities (with 78,000 animals) are in the Santa Ana River Basin and 25 of these facilities (with 48,000 animals) are in the San Jacinto River Basin.

5. This Order applies to owners and/or operators (hereinafter Dischargers) of any existing CAFOs that discharge pollutants to waters of the U.S. within the Santa Ana Region.

C. ELIGIBILITY FOR COVERAGE

6. Only those facilities that have coverage under Order No. R8-2013-0001 are eligible for coverage under this Order. New facilities must file a report of waste discharge to be covered under an individual order.

Commented [PB3]: We request clarification that RWQCB is stating New facilities as brand new dairies not change of ownership or modification of an existing dairy.
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7. Dischargers who have submitted a completed Notice of Intent form (NOI, Attachment C), Engineered Waste Management Plan and a Nutrient Management Plan (where applicable) to discharge wastes under Order No. R8-2013-0001, but have not received an authorization, will be covered under this Order upon receipt of the discharge authorization letter from the Executive Officer. The Engineered Waste Management Plan and the Nutrient Management Plan should be prepared as specified under Sections IV.C. and IV.D. of this Order.

8. The following types of facilities are generally not required to obtain coverage under this Order.
   a. Dairies where the animal population is less than 20 (dry or milking cows).
   b. Heifer, calf, or cattle ranches where the herd size is less than 50.

Such facilities are not authorized to discharge wastes which may affect water quality, or cause a nuisance or pollution as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code (Water Code). Persons proposing to discharge wastes from a newly constructed dairy or related facility must obtain coverage under individual waste discharge requirements.

D. ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS

9. To obtain authorization to discharge pollutants under this Order, existing Dischargers must submit a new completed Notice of Intent form within 100 days following the adoption of this Order. The Discharger may declare in the NOI their intent to continue to implement the approved Engineered Waste Management Plan and, if applicable, the approved Nutrient Management Plan for their facilities. If the Discharger does not intend to continue to implement the approved Engineered Waste Management Plan and Nutrient Management Plan, the Discharger must also include new plans with their NOI.

10. If a CAFO changes ownership or if a CAFO is relocated, the Discharger must submit a Notice of Termination form (NOT, Attachment F) for the old facility and a Notice of Intent form (NOI, Attachment C), an Engineered Waste Management Plan, a Nutrient Management Plan (where applicable), and the first annual fee for the new facility.
10. These documents are collectively referred to as permit registration documents.

11. **Some facilities contain dairy herds that are in corrals on separate properties away from the milking parlor. These satellite corrals may occur at dairies where the milk parlor has been decommissioned but the corrals are still used to keep non-milking animals. These corrals may be on properties that have had Engineered Waste Management Plans (EWMPs) prepared and approved for the property. Unless a Discharger intends to prepare a new EWMP, they are required to report and implement all EWMPs approved for all properties where their herds are located.**

12. If an EWMP or Nutrient Management Plan has already been prepared and approved for a facility, the Discharger does not need to submit these documents if they expressly intend to implement them as identified in the NOI form or in separate written notice to the Regional Board.

13. All necessary permit registration documents must be submitted to the Regional Board office at the following address:
   
   Santa Ana Regional Board - Dairy Program  
   3737 Main Street, Suite 500  
   Riverside, CA 92501

14. Information regarding the availability of the NOI, Engineered Waste Management Plan and the Nutrient Management Plan will be posted for a minimum of 30 days for public comments. If conditions are included, a draft discharge authorization letter will also be posted for a minimum of 30 days for public comments. These documents will be made available to interested parties upon request. If no significant comments are received, a final discharge authorization letter will be issued by the Executive Officer of the Regional Board to all facilities that meet the requirements specified in this Order. If there are significant comments that cannot be resolved, the application package will be scheduled for consideration by the Regional Board. If the CAFO does not meet the requirements specified herein, the Executive Officer will notify the facility operator that they are required to submit a report of waste discharge. Individual waste discharge requirements will be developed for consideration by the Regional Board.

E. TERMINATION OF COVERAGE

15. Where a discharger ceases operating a permitted facility, the Discharger shall submit a written Notice of Termination form (NOT, Attachment F) to the
Regional Board office. The Discharger shall indicate in the NOT how potential pollutants will be controlled or the party who will be responsible for controlling discharges from the facility following the termination of operations. If Regional Board staff determines that discharges of pollutants will be controlled, the Executive Officer will approve the NOT in writing and coverage under this Order will be terminated.

16. Where a facility is being closed, the Discharger must completely clean out the facility and ensure that there is no remaining potential for a discharge of pollutants (including, but not limited to, manure, litter and process wastewater) from the facility. The standard procedures may include, but are not limited to, scraping all manure from the corral areas and containment ponds, including any contaminated soil, and filling in the containment pond(s) with clean dirt.

17. Where a facility is being taken over by another eligible discharger or turned over for uses unrelated to dairies, the previous discharger may terminate coverage without cleaning the facility if the new discharger or the landowner takes responsibility for potential pollutants from the facility. This may be indicated by the new discharger submitting a completed NOI form for coverage under this Order, completing a NOI for coverage under the Construction General Permit, with expressed written agreement from the property owner, or some other form acceptable to the Executive Officer.

F. CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP

18. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger must submit an NOT as described above and notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, and a copy of the notice must be immediately forwarded to the Regional Board.

G. CONVERSION FROM GENERAL PERMIT TO INDIVIDUAL PERMIT

19. The Executive Officer of the Regional Board or the Regional Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) may require any person authorized to discharge wastes under this Order to subsequently apply for and obtain individual waste discharge requirements. Cases where individual waste discharge requirements may be required include the following:

   a. The Discharger is not in compliance with the conditions of this Order or the discharge authorization letter from the Executive Officer;
   b. New effluent limitation guidelines are promulgated for point sources covered by this General NPDES permit;
   c. Changes to the Basin Plan containing requirements applicable to the regulated facilities are approved;
d. The requirements of 40 C.F.R. 122.28(a) are not met; or

e. The discharge may adversely affect the water quality objectives of the receiving waters.

H. LEGAL AUTHORITY

20. This Order is issued pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA and implementing regulations adopted by the USEPA and Chapter 5.5, Division 7 of the California Water Code (Water Code, commencing with section 13370). This Order serves as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from CAFOs. This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements pursuant to Article 4, Chapter 4, Division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with Section 13260). USEPA has promulgated Effluent Limitation Guidelines and Standards for CAFOs that are contained in 40 C.F.R. part 412. Additional guidelines and standards are contained in 40 C.F.R. §§122.23 and 122.42.

21. Regulations governing discharges from CAFOs, including dairies, are contained in California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 27, division 2, chapter 7, subchapter 2, article 1.

I. LEGAL BASIS AND RATIONALE FOR REQUIREMENTS

22. The Fact Sheet (Attachment D) contains the legal basis, background information and rationale for requirements contained in this Order. The Fact Sheet is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes part of the Findings for this Order. Attachments A through G are also incorporated into this Order. However, the Executive Officer is authorized to make changes to the attached forms that are necessary to implement this Order, consistent with 40 C.F.R. part 412 and sections 122.23, and 122.42.

J. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

23. This Order is both an NPDES permit, issued pursuant to federal law, and WDRs, issued pursuant to State law. Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. Public Resources Code sections 21000-21177. Requirements for “new sources” as defined in section 306 of the CWA are not covered by the exemption.

24. The renewal of WDRs or NPDES permits for existing facilities is exempt from CEQA requirements under CCR, title 14, section 15301. This Order is only applicable to existing facilities that are or have been regulated under Order No. R8-2013-0001.

1 Available at: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Laws/Regulations/Title27/
25. Food and Agricultural Code section 33487 exempts state agencies from any requirement to prepare a CEQA document for CAFOs under the following circumstances: (1) when the dairy will be constructed and operated in accordance with the minimum standards in Chapter 5 of the Food and Agricultural Code; (2) where the applicable local agencies have completed all necessary reviews and approvals including those that are required by CEQA; and (3) where a permit for construction was issued by a local agency on or after the effective date of Food and Agricultural Code section 33487 and construction has begun.

K. TECHNOLOGY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS (TBELs)

26. CWA section 301(b) and its implementing regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(a) require that permits include applicable TBELs and any more stringent effluent limitation necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. As such, all Dischargers under this Order must meet the federal technology-based standards as per 40 C.F.R. Section 412.31 representing the application of Best Practicable Control Technology (BPT). 40 C.F.R. part 412, Subpart C – Dairy Cows and Cattle Other Than Veal Calves, contains effluent limitation guidelines for CAFOs. These requirements are incorporated into this Order in Section II.B.1.

L. WATER QUALITY-BASED EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS (WQBELs) AND TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS (TMDLs)

27. CWA section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d) require that permits include WQBELs to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters. Where numeric water quality criteria have not been established, 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d) specifies that WQBELs may be established using USEPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), proposed State criteria, a State policy that interprets narrative criteria supplemented with other relevant information, or an indicator parameter. 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(k)(3) allows the use of BMPs to control or abate the discharge of pollutants when numeric effluent limitations are infeasible or when practices are reasonably necessary to achieve effluent limitations and standards or to carry out the purposes and intent of the CWA. As supported in detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment D), the Regional Board has determined that it is infeasible to include numeric WQBELs in this Order. Therefore, this Order requires CAFOs to implement best management practices, such as developing and implementing Engineered Waste Management Plans and Nutrient Management Plans and performing focused monitoring.
28. Federal regulations [40CFR § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B)] require inclusion of effluent limits that are “consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any available waste load allocation for the discharge prepared by the State and approved by EPA.” Currently, there are two total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) that have waste load allocations for the CAFOs in the region. These TMDLs are (1) the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDLs and (2) Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore Nutrient TMDLs. This Order includes requirements in Section IV necessary to achieve the waste load allocations by the deadlines specified in the approved TMDLs.

M. WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLANS

29. The Regional Board adopted a revised Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana Region (Basin Plan) that became effective on January 24, 1995. The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters in the Santa Ana Region. Since 1995, the Basin Plan has been amended a number of times.

30. The existing and potential beneficial uses of the various surface waters that could be impacted by the discharge of wastes from dairy and/or dairy related facilities in the Santa Ana Region include one or more of the following:

1. Municipal and Domestic Supply,
2. Agricultural Supply,
3. Industrial Service Supply,
4. Groundwater Recharge,
5. Water Contact Recreation,
6. Non-contact Water Recreation,
7. Warm Freshwater Habitat,
8. Limited Warm Freshwater Habitat,
9. Wildlife Habitat,
10. Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species, and

31. The existing and potential beneficial uses of groundwaters that could be impacted by the discharge of dairy wastes within the Santa Ana Region include one or more of the following:

1. Municipal and Domestic Supply,
2. Agricultural Supply,
3. Industrial Service Supply, and
4. Industrial Process Supply
N. NATIONAL TOXICS RULE (NTR) AND CALIFORNIA TOXICS RULE (CTR) [Not Applicable]

O. STATE IMPLEMENTATION POLICY [Not Applicable]

P. COMPLIANCE SCHEDULES AND INTERIM REQUIREMENTS

32. The Basin Plan contains schedules for achieving compliance with waste load allocations for bacterial indicator (Middle Santa Ana River) and nutrients (Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake watershed). This Order requires CAFOs within those watersheds to develop and implement control measures to comply with the waste load allocations as per the time schedules specified in the approved TMDLs.

33. The Basin Plan specifies that when the Regional Board determines that it is infeasible to achieve compliance with an effluent limitation specified to implement a new water quality objective, the Regional Board may establish a schedule for compliance in waste discharge requirements. The State Board adopted Resolution No. 2008-0025, Policy for Compliance Schedules in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits. Schedules specified in this Order are consistent with the Policy.

Q. ANTI-DEGRADATION POLICY

34. Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 require that State water quality standards include an anti-degradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California’s Anti-degradation policy in State Water Board Resolution 68-16, which incorporates the requirements of the federal Anti-degradation policy. Resolution 68-16 requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. As discussed in the Fact Sheet (Attachment D), the permitted discharge is consistent with the anti-degradation provision of 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.

R. ANTI-BACKSLIDING REQUIREMENTS

35. Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order.
S. PROVISIONS IMPLEMENTING STATE LAW

36. Provision II.D.2. implements state law only. Since this provision is not required or authorized under the CWA, violations of this provision are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES permit violations. State Water Code provides other enforcement remedies.

T. MONITORING AND REPORTING

37. Section 122.48 of 40 C.F.R. requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Sections 13267 and 13383 of the Water Code authorize the Regional Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement these Federal and State requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment B.

U. STANDARD AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS

38. Standard Provisions, which, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41 and 122.42, apply to all NPDES discharges and must be included in every NPDES permit, are provided in Attachment A. The Regional Board has also included in this Order special provisions applicable to the Dischargers. The rationale for the special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the Fact Sheet (Attachment D).

V. NOTIFICATION OF INTERESTED PARTIES

39. The Regional Board has notified the Dischargers and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe Waste Discharge Requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of notification are provided in the Fact Sheet (Attachment D) of this Order.

W. CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC COMMENT

40. The Regional Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet (Attachment D).

X. ALASKA RULE
41. On March 30, 2000, USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised State and Tribal water quality standards (WQS) become effective for CWA purposes (40 C.F.R. § 131.21, 65 FR 24641, April 27, 2000). Under the revised regulation (also known as the Alaska rule), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after May 30, 2000, must be approved by USEPA before being used for CWA purposes. The final rule also provides that standards already in effect and submitted to USEPA by May 30, 2000, may be used for CWA purposes, whether or not approved by USEPA.

Y. STRINGENCY OF REQUIREMENTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLLUTANTS

42. This Order includes both technology and water quality-based effluent limitations. The technology-based effluent limitations are based on the USEPA’s effluent limitation guidelines for this industrial category. Water quality-based effluent limitations are scientifically derived to implement the water quality objectives specified in the Basin Plan.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Discharger, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the Clean Water Act, as amended, and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, must comply with the following:

II. PERMIT PROVISIONS

A. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

1. The discharge of wastes to land or to surface waters, including storm water conveyance systems, shall be in accordance with the provisions of this Order. All other discharges of wastes to land and surface waters are prohibited.

2. The discharge of wastes to land or to surface waters shall not cause a condition of contamination, pollution or nuisance as defined in Water Code section 13050.

3. The discharge of wastes not generated by the dairy-related activities at the facility is prohibited except as authorized by the Executive Officer in a discharge authorization letter.

4. The disposal of any mortality (dead animals) in any process wastewater system, liquid manure or other facilities within the regulated CAFO is prohibited.
5. The discharge of process wastewater to a land application area before, during or after a storm event that would result in runoff of the applied water is prohibited.

6. The discharge of dairy waste or process wastewater to surface waters from cropland is prohibited. Irrigation supply water that comes into contact or is blended with waste or process wastewater shall be considered wastewater under this prohibition.

7. The discharge of storm water to surface waters from a land application area where manure or process wastewater has been applied is prohibited unless the land application area has been managed according to an approved Nutrient Management Plan and EWMP.

8. The discharge of wastes, including manure, process wastewater and/or storm water runoff from manured areas, to property not owned or controlled by the Discharger, except as authorized by this Order, is prohibited.

9. Temporary waste storage areas shall be designed and constructed in a manner to prevent runoff and leachate from entering surface or groundwater.

10. Waste storage or disposal facilities shall not be built within 400 feet of a public drinking water well.

11. Confined animals are prohibited from entering or directly contacting any surface water. CCR, title 27, § 22561, 40 C.F.R. § 122.42(e). The Discharger must prevent animals confined at the CAFO from entering any surface water.

12. The disposal of manure to any land within Chino Basin (Chino-North, Chino-East, and Chino-South Groundwater Management Zones) is prohibited unless a plan, acceptable to the Executive Officer, is implemented that offsets the effects of such application on the underlying groundwater management zone. The Optimum Basin Management Plan, discussed in the Fact Sheet, addresses the discharge of wastes from CAFOs within the Chino Basin area. Continued, effective implementation of the Optimum Basin Management Plan is an acceptable offset to manage CAFO waste discharges within the Chino Basin area.

13. Manure originating from outside of the Chino Basin is prohibited from being applied to land within the Chino Basin.
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The application of manure, process wastewater, and/or storm water runoff from manured areas, on land in the San Jacinto River Basin that overlie groundwater management zones lacking assimilative capacity for TDS and/or nitrate-nitrogen is prohibited. This prohibition shall apply unless the Dischargers demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer, that a plan is being developed and implemented that ultimately offsets the effects of such application on the underlying groundwater management zone according to the requirements of Section IV.I. below.

The discharge of any substances in concentrations that are toxic to animal or plant life is prohibited.

B. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

1. Technology-based Effluent Limitations (TBELs)

Discharges of waste in storm water runoff from production areas and in process wastewater are authorized only under the following conditions:

a. The principal cause of the discharge is due to a precipitation event;

b. Containment structures have been designed, constructed, operated and maintained to contain all manure, litter, process wastewater, and the runoff and the direct precipitation from all rainfall events up to and including a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event from the production area;

c. All provisions of an Engineered Waste Management Plan (EWMP), approved by the Executive Officer, are fully implemented;

d. The operations at the facility are conducted according to the additional measures required by 40 C.F.R. § 412.37(a) and (b) and according to the requirements of this Order and the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment B).

2. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

Water quality-based effluent limitations are included in Section IV. These consist of limitations designed to cause the Discharger to attain waste load allocations for CAFOs found in adopted Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).

See Glossary for the definition of Production Area.
C. RECLAMATION SPECIFICATIONS [Not Applicable]

D. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

1. Surface Water Limitations
   a. The discharge of wastes from the regulated facilities to surface waters shall not cause or contribute to an exceedance of any applicable water quality objectives in the receiving waters specified in the Basin Plan.
   b. The discharge of wastes shall not cause receiving waters to contain floating materials, foam, or scum in quantities that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
   c. The discharge of wastes shall not cause bottom deposits in the receiving waters to the extent that such deposits cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
   d. The discharge of wastes shall not cause receiving waters to contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses of receiving waters.
   e. The discharge of wastes shall not cause an individual pesticide or combination of pesticides to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses of receiving waters.
   f. The discharge of wastes shall not cause bioaccumulation of pesticides, fungicides, or other toxic pollutants in bottom sediments or in aquatic life to levels which are harmful to human health or aquatic organisms.

2. Groundwater Limitations
   The discharge of wastes to the ground shall not cause or contribute to an exceedance of any applicable water quality objectives specified in the Basin Plan.

III. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. GENERAL
1. This Order expires on December 15, 2023. However, coverage under the Order shall continue in force and effect until a new order replaces this Order. Only those Dischargers authorized to discharge under the expiring Order are covered by the continued order. Upon reissuance of a new order, the Dischargers shall file a new application not more than 45 days following the effective date of the new order and obtain a new authorization to discharge from the Executive Officer.

2. The Executive Officer shall, if necessary, specify any additional conditions necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters in the Discharge Authorization Letter, and shall specify the Self-Monitoring Program for the proposed discharge in accordance with this Order. If the Executive Officer includes additional conditions, a draft Discharge Authorization Letter will be posted for public comment 30-days prior to the final letter being issued. The Discharger shall comply with all the requirements of this Order and the terms and conditions of the final Discharge Authorization Letter. The authorization to discharge may be terminated or revised by the Executive Officer at any time. The Authorization Letter shall be incorporated as terms and conditions of the Order for the Discharger.

3. The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Regional Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order.

4. The provisions of this Order are severable, and if any provision of this Order, or the application of any provisions of this Order to any circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other circumstances, and the remainder of this Order shall not be affected thereby.

5. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from the facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, State, or federal law enforcement entities.

6. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, discharge limitation, or receiving water limitation of this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Board by telephone (951) 782-4130 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance that may endanger public health or the environment. The Discharger shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless Regional Board staff waives the written notification. The written notification Commented [PB12]: We believe this was not your intent as worded. Please clarify.
shall state the nature, time, duration, and cause of noncompliance, and shall describe the measures being taken to remedy the current noncompliance and, prevent recurrence including, where applicable, a schedule of implementation. All other noncompliance should be reported in the Annual Report. Also see Standard Provisions, Attachment A, Section V.E.

7. This Order shall serve as a general NPDES permit pursuant to Section 402 of the Federal CWA and amendments thereto, which shall become effective upon its adoption provided the Regional Administrator of the USEPA has no objection. If the Regional Administrator objects to its issuance, the Order shall not serve as a general NPDES permit until such objection is withdrawn.

8. The Executive Officer shall determine whether the proposed discharge is eligible for coverage under this order, after which, the Executive Officer may:

a. Authorize the proposed discharge by transmitting a discharge authorization letter to the Discharger authorizing the discharge under the conditions of this Order and any other conditions consistent with this Order that are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters; or,

b. Require the Discharger to submit a report of waste discharge to obtain individual waste discharge requirements prior to any discharge to waters within the Regional Board’s jurisdiction.

9. All discharges from the facility must comply with the lawful requirements of municipalities, counties, drainage districts, and other local agencies regarding discharges of storm water to storm drain systems or other courses under their jurisdiction.

10. The Discharger must comply with all Federal, State, County and local laws and regulations pertaining to the discharge of wastes from the facility.

11. The Discharger must comply with all requirements of this Order and, in addition, all terms, conditions, and limitations specified in the discharge authorization letter issued by the Executive Officer.

B. MONITORING AND REPORTING

1. The Discharger **must** comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program requirements in Attachment B, as later amended or revised, of this Order.
C. REOPENER PROVISIONS

1. This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by a Discharger for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination of this Order or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any permit condition.

2. If more stringent applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to Section 303 of the Federal CWA, or amendments thereto, the Regional Board may revise and modify this Order in accordance with such standards.

3. This Order may be reopened to address any changes in State or Federal statutes, plans, policies or regulations that would affect the requirements for the discharges covered by this Order including newly adopted TMDLs.

IV. SPECIAL PROVISIONS

A. REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCHARGES FROM CONTAINMENT STRUCTURES

1. Containment structures must be designed, constructed, operated and maintained to contain all manure, litter, process wastewater, and the runoff and the direct precipitation from all rainfall events up to and including a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event from the production area.

2. New wastewater containment facilities constructed after the effective date of this Order must be lined with, or underlain by soils which contain at least 10% clay and not more than 10% gravel or artificial materials of equivalent impermeability.

3. A level marker shall be placed within each pond or impoundment to indicate the minimum capacity necessary to contain the runoff and direct precipitation from a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event.
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a. Indicators on a level marker shall reflect a combination of all freeboard capacity for the minimum capacity must be placed by a licensed surveyor or similarly-qualified person.

b. The Discharger must confirm in the facility's annual report that the markers are valid indicators of the required minimum capacity.
4. Following a storm event, the Discharger must initiate substantive work to restore the minimum holding capacity of containment structures within 48 hours. No work is necessary if observations show that containment structures will restore their minimum holding capacity within 48 hours with no intervention by the operator. The minimum holding capacity is represented by the minimum freeboard indicated by a valid marker in Provision IV.A.2.

5. The Discharger must have an effective program measures to monitor and control threats to the integrity of containment structures. Such threats include but are not limited to burrowing rodents, penetration or displacement by plant roots, and erosion.

6. Containment structures must be equipped with an emergency outlet to prevent catastrophic failure of the structure in the event of overflow.

7. Containment structures and manured areas at CAFOs in operation on November 27, 1984, shall be protected from inundation or washout by overflow from any stream channel during 20-year peak stream flows. Facilities existing before November 27, 1984 that are protected against 100-year peak stream flows shall continue to be provided such protection. New facilities (built after November 27, 1984) shall be protected from 100-year peak stream flows (CCR title 27, § 22562(c)).

8. No containment structures shall be constructed of manure and manure shall not be used to improve or raise existing containment structures.

9. Manure scraped from the corrals shall be removed from the facility within 180 days. Any manure remaining at the facility after 180 days of being scraped from the corrals is considered to be disposal of manure and is prohibited. A manifest of the manure hauled away (Form 4) shall be prepared and submitted with the annual report in accordance with Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment B).
10. Prior to transferring manure, litter or process wastewater to other persons, the Discharger shall provide the recipient of the manure, litter or process wastewater with the most current nutrient analysis of the manure. The analysis provided must be consistent with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 412, and, in addition, must include analysis for constituents specified in Attachment B. The CAFO operators shall collect representative samples of manure at least once per calendar year during a corral cleaning event, analyze for nutrients (nitrate-nitrogen and phosphorus), and retain the records for five years.

11. All surface drainage from outside of the facility (such as, but not limited to, from streets or neighboring property) shall be diverted away from any manured areas unless drainage from the manured areas are fully contained on site.

12. Chemicals and other contaminants handled on-site shall not be disposed of in any manure, litter, process wastewater, or storm water storage or treatment system unless specifically designed to treat such chemicals and other contaminants.

B. REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCHARGES FROM NON-PRODUCTION AREAS

1. The Discharger must implement an effective program measures to prevent storm water from contacting manure, feed, and other potential sources of pollutants in non-production areas where storm water runoff is conveyed off-site. The Discharger must:
   a. Divert storm water runoff away from areas where potential pollutants may be mobilized and carried off-site.
   b. Implement effective housekeeping.
   c. Not allow track-out of manure and other potential pollutants from the production area onto non-production areas or off-site.

2. The Discharger must implement effective measures to have an effective program to identify and eliminate the discharge of pollutants in non-storm water from non-production areas of the facility.
1.20 C. ENGINEERED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. The Discharger must control the discharge of waste from production and non-production areas according to an Engineered Waste Management Plan that has been approved by the Executive Officer and prepared according to this Order. Where there is a conflict between the approved plan and the requirements of this Order, this Order shall prevail.

2. Except for inconsequential grammatical corrections, updates to the Discharger’s name and contact information, and technical corrections, an approved Engineered Waste Management Plan may not be amended without the approval of the Executive Officer.

3. A copy of the approved Engineered Waste Management Plan must be maintained on-site and the person responsible for the operation of the dairy must be familiar with its content. The approved plan must be made available to Regional Board, State Board, USEPA staff and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon request.

4. Engineered Waste Management Plans must be prepared by, or under the direction of, a registered professional engineer or other similarly-qualified individual. The registered professional engineer shall affix their stamp and signature to the plan.

5. Upon completion of construction of all structures identified in the approved Engineered Waste Management Plan, the Discharger must submit a certification from the engineer or the similarly-qualified individual responsible for the preparation of the plan. The certification must establish that all structures have been constructed according to the specifications in the plan.

6. Engineered Waste Management Plans must be updated where there is a substantial change in a facility’s operations that may affect the capacity of containment structures to discharge according to the requirements of this Order.

7. Engineered Waste Management Plans must fully and accurately represent all structures, controls, and practices necessary to allow a discharge of waste from production areas in accordance with the requirements of this Order.
8. An Engineered Waste Management Plan must include:
   a. Specifications for the location and construction of containment structures;
   b. Specifications for the placement of overflow outlets and minimum capacity markers;
   c. Controls to prevent manure, litter, and process wastewater from being applied or accumulate closer than 100-feet to any down-gradient surface water, open tile line intake structures, sinkholes, well heads, or other conduits to surface or groundwater.
   d. Controls to prevent erosion of soil that may diminish the capacity of containment structures;
   e. A site plan depicting a through d above; and
   f. Calculations for the volume of containment structures
   g. Procedures for restoring the minimum holding capacity represented by the minimum freeboard indicated by a valid marker in Provision IV.A.3.1.21, and
   h. A schedule of operation and maintenance practices necessary to maintain compliance with this Order and the Engineered Waste Management Plan.

9. The Executive Officer is authorized to, with written notice, direct a Discharger to amend the facility’s Engineered Waste Management Plan to correct or clarify the contents of the plan or to comply with the requirements of this Order. A directive must be complied with by a deadline specified in the notice. The Executive Officer is authorized to waive Provision IV.C.4. to allow a Discharger to make amendments where technical expertise is not needed.

10. A new or amended Engineered Waste Management Plan will be subject to public review for 30 days prior to its approval by the Executive Officer.
D. NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. The application of manure and other dairy-related waste to cropland at the dairy facility must occur be carried out in accordance with this Order and a nutrient management plan that has been approved by the Executive Officer. Where there is a conflict between the approved plan and the requirements of this Order, this Order shall prevail.

2. A copy of the approved nutrient management plan must be maintained on-site and the person responsible for the operation of the dairy must be familiar with its content. The approved plan must be made available to Regional Board, State Board, USEPA staff and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon request.

3. Except for inconsequential grammatical corrections and technical corrections, an approved nutrient management plan may not be altered without the approval of the Executive Officer.

4. Nutrient management plans must be prepared by a Certified Nutrient Management Planner meeting competency and knowledge requirements established by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS).

5. Nutrient management plans must be in substantial conformance with NRCS Conservation Practices Standard 5907.

6. The nutrient management plan must specify application rates and controls for manure, litter, and process wastewater applied to land. The controls must minimize the transport of wastewater, phosphorous and nitrogen to waters of the state.

   a. Application rates must be informed by annual analysis of nitrogen and phosphorous in the applied manure and by an analysis of nitrogen and phosphorous in the land’s soil. The analysis of soil must be performed a minimum of once every five years.
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b. Application rates must take into consideration the nutrient needs of cover crops and harvested crops and consider other sources of nutrients other than applied manure and other dairy-related wastes.

c. Manure, litter, and process wastewater shall not be applied, or allowed to accumulate, closer than 100 feet to any down-gradient surface waters, open tile line intake structures, sinkholes, production well heads, monitoring wells, or other similar conduits to surface or ground waters.

7. The Executive Officer is authorized to, with written notice, direct a Discharger to amend the facility’s nutrient management plan to reflect substantial changes to operations, to correct or clarify the contents of the plan, or to comply with the requirements of this Order. A directive must be complied with by a deadline specified in the notice. The Executive Officer is authorized to waive Provision IV.D.4. to allow amendments where technical expertise is not needed.

8. A new or amended nutrient management plan will be subject to public review for 30 days prior to its approval by the Executive Officer.

E. ANIMAL MORTALITIES

1. Animal mortalities shall be handled in such a way as to prevent the discharge of pollutants to waters of the State.

2. All dead animals shall be disposed of off-site within three (3) days according to local and state regulations.

3. Records of mortality management shall be kept for five years.

F. SPECIAL STUDIES

[This Section is being kept as a placeholder.]

G. REGION-WIDE SALT AND NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

*See 40 C.F.R. § 122.42(e)(6)(iii) for a list of changes that would constitute a substantial change.*
The following requirements apply to all Dischargers and their dairies and related facilities in the Santa Ana Region subject to this Order:

1. If not prohibited, a Discharger may apply, or cause to be applied, manure and dairy related waste to cropland not owned or controlled by them only with the written permission of the operator or land owner receiving the waste for beneficial agricultural use:
   a. The Discharger must provide a copy of the written permission to the Regional Board within 60 days of the effective date of this Order;
   b. The written permission must include:
      i. The signature of the agricultural operator or land owner;
      ii. Valid contact information for the agricultural operator or land owner. Persons enrolled under a conditional waiver of waste discharge requirements for agricultural discharges may use the unique identifier assigned under that program for their contact information;
      iii. The assessor’s parcel number(s) of the land where the waste is authorized to be applied;
      iv. The expiration date of the written permission, if applicable. If there is no expiration, this must be indicated; and
      v. Any conditions on the timing, quantity, or limits of waste application imposed by the agricultural operator or landowner, including specification of dates during which manure may be applied; upper limits on the quantity of waste permitted; specified application rates; and excluded areas of the property.
   c. The Discharger must notify the Regional Board in writing where an agricultural operator or land owner rescinds or amends their written permission. The notification must be provided within 30-days of the Discharger becoming aware of the rescission or amendment.
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d. If a written permission is amended or new letter is obtained, the Discharger must provide a copy of the amended or new permission to the Regional Board within 60 days of its date.

e. The Discharger must include, in their Annual Report, a confirmation that the written permission(s) in Regional Board records is valid and in full effect.

H. BACTERIAL INDICATOR TMDLs REQUIREMENTS FOR CHINO BASIN

The following requirements of this Subsection IV.H. shall apply only to those Dischargers and their dairies and related facilities that are tributary to the Middle Santa Ana River:

1. The Discharger must implement, or cause to be implemented on their behalf, the water quality monitoring plan approved by the Regional Board on June 29, 2007 in Resolution No. R8-2007-0046, as subsequently amended or revised.

   a. The Discharger must submit, or cause to be submitted on their behalf, the results of the water quality monitoring to the Regional Board by May 31 of each year.

   b. The results of the water quality monitoring must include an analysis designed to conclusively adequately demonstrate achievement, or progress towards achievement, of the CAFO bacterial indicator waste load allocations pursuant to the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDLs.

   c. If the analysis of the water quality monitoring results is inconclusive or reveals opportunities for improvements to the monitoring plan, the Discharger, in cooperation with other stakeholders, must include recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the monitoring program in the annual report.

   d. If the analysis of the water quality monitoring results does not indicate that the CAFO waste load allocations are being met; that waste load allocations are not likely to be met by December 31, 2025; or that water quality objectives are not being attained, the Discharger, in cooperation with other stakeholders, must propose...
improvements to watershed-wide projects or programs that may improve water quality.

f. After December 31, 2025, if the Discharger does not comply with the provisions of this Subsection IV.H.1., the Discharger must immediately comply with the following water quality-based effluent limit during wet weather conditions (November 1 through March 31):

\[ \text{Escherichia coli} \text{ waste load allocation (WLA): The 5-sample, 30-day logarithmic mean of Escherichia coli in discharges from the facility must be less than 113 organisms/100 mL and not more than 10\% of the samples may exceed 212 organisms/100 mL for any 30-day period.} \]

2. If the Discharger does not comply with the requirements of Subsections IV.A. and IV.B., the Discharger must immediately comply with the following water quality-based effluent limit during dry weather conditions (April 1 through October 31):

\[ \text{Escherichia coli WLA: The 5-sample, 30-day logarithmic mean of Escherichia coli in discharges from the facility must be less than 113 organisms/100 mL and not more than 10\% of the samples may exceed 212 organisms/100 mL for any 30-day period.} \]

I. SALT MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR CHINO BASIN

The following requirements of this subsection IV.I. shall apply only to those Dischargers and their dairies and related facilities that overly the Chino Basin and the groundwater management zones located there:

1. The Discharger must cause, or have caused on their behalf, an effective program that offsets the addition of dissolved solids (salt) in discharges of waste to the Chino Basin groundwater management zones from the Discharger’s overlying facilities. The program is subject to the approval of the Regional Board. The program is currently being carried out through the Optimum Basin Management Program.
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Commented [PB26]: In 2012, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board amended the Basin Plan to enact provisions which temporarily suspend application of REC-1 beneficial uses and the related bacteria standards during unsafe high flows which occur during certain wet weather conditions. The amendment was subsequently approved by the State Board, OAL and EPA. In 2015, the Middle Santa Ana River Task Force petitioned the Regional Board to reopen and revise the bacteria TMDL to account for these changes in water quality standards. Board staff, citing a lack of resources and several competing priorities, stated that it was not possible to undertake a TMDL revision at that time and indicated that, in the interim, these issues could easily be addressed during the normal permitting process. Therefore, the effluent limit in Section IV-H-1-f should apply during wet weather conditions except when the REC-1 uses and related bacteria objectives in the receiving water have been temporarily suspended.
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2. The Discharger must perform an evaluation, or have an evaluation performed on their behalf, of the offset program in Provision IV.I.1. above.
   a. The evaluation must assess the effectiveness of the program to remove dissolved solids from the underlying groundwater management zone at a rate that equals the rate of dissolved solids added in discharges from dairies and related facilities. Facilities may be evaluated collectively or individually as necessary.
   b. The evaluation must be based on a reliable combination of theoretical and empirical data using published and generally accepted methods.
   c. The Discharger must submit, or cause the submission on their behalf, a report on the results of the evaluation to the Regional Board by January 31 of each year for the previous calendar year.

J. SALT AND NUTRIENT REQUIREMENTS FOR SAN JACINTO BASIN

The following requirements of this subsection (IV.J) shall apply only to those Dischargers and their dairies and related facilities that overly the San Jacinto River Basin and the groundwater management zones located there:

1. The Discharger must perform, or have performed on their behalf, groundwater monitoring of wells under their ownership or control to evaluate the potential impact of dairy operations on the underlying groundwater.

2. To the extent practicable, the Discharger must:
   a. reduce manure and wastewater application to croplands;
   b. reduce salt content in the source water;
   c. implement on-site wastewater treatment processes;
   d. consider implementing regional wastewater treatment systems; and
   e. participate in local groundwater improvement projects.
3. The Discharger must implement, or cause to be implemented on their behalf, the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs water quality monitoring plan approved by the Regional Board on March 3, 2006 in Resolution No. R8-2006-0031, as subsequently amended or revised.

   a. The Discharger must submit, or cause to be submitted on their behalf, the results of the water quality monitoring plan to the Regional Board by August 15 of each year.

   b. The results of the water quality monitoring plan must include an analysis designed to adequately demonstrate achievement, or progress towards achievement, of the CAFO waste load allocation for Canyon Lake and the water quality objectives of the lakes.

   c. If the analysis of the water quality monitoring results is inconclusive or reveals opportunities for improvements to the monitoring plan, the Discharger, in cooperation with other stakeholders, must include recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the monitoring program in the annual report.

   d. If the analysis of the water quality monitoring results does not indicate that the CAFO waste load allocation is being met or that water quality objectives are not being attained, the Discharger, in cooperation with other stakeholders, must propose improvements to watershed-wide projects or programs that may improve water quality.

   e. After December 31, 2020, if the Discharger does not comply with the provisions of this Subsection IV.J.3., the Discharger must comply with the following water quality-based effluent limits:

      Total Phosphorous WLA: Discharges from CAFOs must not transport more than 132 kg/year of total phosphorous to Canyon Lake, based on a 10-year running average.

      Total Nitrogen WLA: Discharges from CAFOs must not transport more than 1,908 kg/year of total nitrogen to Canyon Lake, based on a 10-year running average.
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Commented [PB33]: Use of the word "or" in the above paragraph would obligate CAFOs to implement additional projects or programs if water quality objectives are not being met even if the CAFOs are in compliance with their wasteload allocation. If the CAFOs are meeting their wasteload allocation, then they are not causing or contributing to an exceedance of water quality standards in the receiving water. Under such circumstances the CAFOs should not be required to implement additional projects or programs that are designed to address exceedances caused by other (non-CAFO) sources. We ask that the RWQCB consult on these issues with TMDL staff/Ken Thiesen.
V. DETERMINING COMPLIANCE

A. Compliance determination with the terms of this Order shall be based on the following:

1. Periodic inspections by Regional Board staff and/or USEPA or its authorized representatives;

2. Evaluation of the Annual Report of Animal Waste Discharge and Annual Summary Report of CAFO Storm Water Management Structure Inspections submitted according to the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment B);

3. Evaluation of Workplans and other reports required for compliance with the TMDLs, salt and nutrient management; and

4. Any other information deemed necessary by the Executive Officer.

f. Add subsection f : Section IV-J-3 should be amended to include a new subsection (f) which explicitly authorizes the CAFO permittees to rely on an approved Offset Program to demonstrate compliance with the applicable waste load allocations specified in the Nutrient TMDL. Similar language appears in the Riverside MS4 permit and in Elsinore Valley MWD’s discharge permit (see copies attached). This provision is necessary in order to address loads that may occur during extreme wet weather (>25-year, 24-hour storm event) because there is no reasonable, feasible or practicable method of preventing such discharges.

g. Add subsection g—Section IV-J-3 should be amended to include a new subsection (g) stating that the CAFO permittees are allowed to demonstrate compliance with the applicable waste load allocations by showing that the receiving water is meeting the applicable Response Targets specified in the Nutrient TDML. A similar provision was added to the Riverside MS4 Permit in 2010.
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ii. Indirectly, using water quality monitoring data and other biological metrics approved by the Regional Board, to show Water Quality Standards are being consistently attained (as measured by the response targets identified in the LE/CL TMDL). The TMDLs explicitly support the trading of pollutant allocations among sources to the extent that such allocation tradeoffs optimize point and non-point source control strategies to achieve the WQBELs in the most efficient manner.

d. Total Inorganic Nitrogen (TIN): The 12-month running average Total Inorganic Nitrogen (TIN) concentration of the discharge from DP-002 shall not exceed 1 mg/L, unless the Discharger implements a plan, with the approval of the Executive Officer, to offset TIN discharges in excess of the TIN limits.

e. Total Nitrogen (TN): Order No. RB-2013-0017 NPDES No. CA8000027 Page 15 of 39 The 12-month running average Total Nitrogen (TN) concentration of the discharge from DP-002 shall not exceed 1 mg/L, and the 5 year running average mass of TN discharged to the Lake shall not exceed 16,372 pounds/year, unless the Discharger implements a plan, with the approval of the Regional Water Board or its Executive Officer, to offset TN discharges in excess of the TN limits.
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I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the conditions of Order No. R8-2018-0001. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the CWA and the Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action, for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification, or denial of a permit renewal application. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)].

2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if Order No. R8-2018-0001 has not been modified to incorporate the requirement. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1)].

B. 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 Order No. R8-2018-0001. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c)].

C. Duty to Mitigate

The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or disposal in violation of Order No. R8-2018-0001 that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d)].

D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

The Discharger shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities, systems of treatment and control mechanisms (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the Discharger to achieve compliance with the conditions of Order No. R8-2018-0001 and the discharge authorization letter from the Executive Officer. Proper operation and maintenance also include regular maintenance and inspection of all systems, record keeping and 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 Order No. R8-2018-0001. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e)].

E. Property Rights

1. Order No. R8-2018-0001 does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g)].

2. Order No. R8-2018-0001 does not authorize the commission of any act causing injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any
infringement of state or local law or regulations nor guarantee the Discharger a capacity right in the receiving waters. [40 C.F.R. § 122.5(c)]

F. Inspection and Entry

The Discharger shall allow the Regional Board, State Board, USEPA 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 [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)][Water Code section 133839c]:

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 Order No. R8-2018-0001 [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1)];

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of Order No. R8-2018-0001 [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2)];

3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under Order No. R8-2018-0001 [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3)]; and

4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4)].

G. Bypass

1. Definitions

a. “Bypass” means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i)].

b. “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)].

2. Bypass not exceeding limitations - The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 and I.G.5, below. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2)].

3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Regional Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)].
a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A)];

b. 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

c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Regional Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C)].

4. The Regional Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Regional Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii)].

5. Notice

a. Anticipated bypass. If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i)].


H. 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. 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 I.H.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)].
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)]:

   a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i)];

   b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii)];

   c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b, below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and


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).)

II. STANDAR D PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION

A. General

Order No. R8-2018-0001 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)].

B. Duty to Reapply

If the Discharger wishes to continue an activity regulated by Order No. R8-2018-0001 after its expiration date, the Discharger must obtain a new permit. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b)]. However, coverage under the Order shall continue in force and effect until a new order replaces Order No. R8-2018-0001. Only those Dischargers authorized to discharge under the expiring Order are covered by the continued order. Upon reissuance of a new Order, the Dischargers shall file a new application within 45 days of the effective date of the new order and obtain a new authorization to discharge from the Executive Officer.

C. Transfers

Order No. R8-2018-0001 is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Regional Board and with written authorization from the Executive Officer. The Regional 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 the Water Code. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(3)] [40 C.F.R. § 122.61].

III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

A. Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1)].

B. Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures under Part 136, unless other test procedures have been specified in Order No. R8-2018-0001. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(4)] [40 C.F.R. § 122.44(i)(1)(iv)].

IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

A. Records Retention

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 Order No. R8-2018-0001, and records of all data used to complete the application for Order No. R8-2018-0001, for a period of at least five (5) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Regional Board Executive Officer at any time. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2)].

B. Records of monitoring information shall include:

1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(i)];
2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(ii)]
3. The date(s) analyses were performed [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iii)];
4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iv)];
5. The analytical techniques or methods used [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(v)]; and
6. The results of such analyses [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(vi)].

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

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

V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

A. Duty to Provide Information

The Discharger shall furnish to the Regional Board, State Board, or USEPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Regional Board, State Board, or USEPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating Order No. R8-2018-0001 or to determine compliance with Order No. R8-2018-0001. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to Regional Board, State Board, USEPA staff and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative) copies of records required to be kept by Order No. R8-2018-0001. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h)] [Water Code 13267].

B. Signatory and Certification Requirements

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Regional Board, State Board, and/or USEPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5, below. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k)].

2. All permit applications shall be signed by a general partner or the proprietor, respectively. [40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(2)].

3. All reports required by Order No. R8-2018-0001 and other information requested by the Regional Board, State Board, or USEPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:

   a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, above [40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1)];

   b. 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

   c. The written authorization is submitted to the Regional Board and State Board [40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3)].
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.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 V.B.3, above must be submitted to the Regional Board and State 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. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, or V.B.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)].

C. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment B) in Order No. R8-2018-0001. [40 C.F.R. § 122.22(l)(4)].

2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Regional Board or State Board for reporting results of any surface water discharges, manure nutrient monitoring and manure use or disposal practices. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i)].

3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by Order No. R8-2018-0001 using test procedures approved under Part 136, or as specified in Order No. R8-2018-0001, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR or manure reporting form specified by the Regional Board. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii)].

4. Calculations for all limitations, which require averaging of measurements, shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in Order No. R8-2018-0001. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii)].

D. Compliance Schedules

Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of Order No. R8-2018-
E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger public 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 submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission 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. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i)].

2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)]:

3. The Regional Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii)].

F. Planned Changes

1. The Discharger shall give notice to the Regional 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)]:
   a. 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. § 122.29(b) [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)]; or
   b. 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 Order No. R8-2018-0001 [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii)]; or
   c. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's manure use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or
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I. 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 Board, State Board, or USEPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. [40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8)].

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

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

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

A. Non-Municipal Facilities

Existing manufacturing, commercial (i.e. dairies, heifer or calf ranches), mining, and silvicultural Dischargers shall notify the Regional Board as soon as they know or have reason to believe [40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)]:

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 Order No. R8-2018-0001, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following "notification levels" [40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(1)]:

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

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

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

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 Order No. R8-2018-0001, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following "notification levels" [40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)]:

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

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

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

d. The level established by the Regional Board in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(f) [40 C.F.R. § 122.42(a)(2)(iv)].

B. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) (Not Applicable)
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Section 122.48 (40 CFR § 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Specific record-keeping, monitoring, and reporting requirements applicable to CAFOs are specified in Section 122.41, 122.42(e)(2)-(4) and 412. California Water Code Sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Board to require technical and monitoring reports. This Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) establishes monitoring and reporting requirements, which implement the Federal and California regulations.

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

A. All monitoring data must be maintained for at least five years and must be made available to Regional Board, State Board, USEPA staff and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon request.

B. All containment structures, including, but not limited to, ponds, berms, and wastewater distribution systems (pumps, pipes, and other mechanical devices) must be inspected at least once each week during the entire year and at least once each 24-hour period during a storm event in which rainfall exceeds 0.5 inches in 24 hours. The findings of these inspections must be documented on a completed CAFO Weekly Storm Water Management Structure Inspections Log Sheet (Form 1). If sufficient space is not available on the form provided, the Discharger must provide supplemental attachment sheets, as needed. Information documented on this form and any attachments must include:

1. An estimate of the freeboard1 for each pond or impoundment as indicated by the required depth marker.

2. Any action taken to correct deficiencies noted as a result of facility inspections. Deficiencies not corrected within 30 days must be accompanied by an explanation of the factors preventing immediate correction.

3. The approximate time of each storm-related discharge that results in an off-property discharge of storm water commingled with process wastewater and/or manure, along with its approximate duration.

C. The Discharger(s) must record each manure-hauling event on a completed Manure Tracking Manifest Form (Form 4).

D. The Discharger must retain for five years records of nutrient analysis for manure. The Discharger must make these records available on request by the Regional Board, USEPA, and its authorized representatives.

II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

1 Freeboard of a pond or impoundment is the vertical separation between the liquid level and the lowest elevation of the containment or impoundment that allows an overflow or outflow from the pond or impoundment.
A representative grab sample of the discharge must be collected for any discharge of wastes from the waste containment structures to surface waters. Each discharge event must be sampled and the samples must be collected within the first hour of discharge or soon thereafter.

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS [NOT APPLICABLE]

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

The samples collected according to Section II above must be analyzed for total dissolved solids (filterable residue), *Escherichia coli*, total nitrogen, total phosphorus and total suspended solids.

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS [NOT APPLICABLE]

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

Land Application System Monitoring: The Discharger must conduct inspections of wastewater distribution systems on an as-needed basis, at least as frequently as cited in Section I.B. Any leaks or other operational problems must be corrected promptly. Records of the inspections and corrective actions must be included in the annual report.

VII. RECLAMATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS [NOT APPLICABLE]

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS [NOT APPLICABLE]

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. The Dischargers must collect a representative sample of manure, at least on an annual basis, during a corral cleaning event. The Discharger must have the sample analyzed for nitrate (as nitrogen), sodium, chloride, calcium, sulfate, potassium, total phosphorus, and total dissolved solids (filterable residue). Sample results must be retained for at least five years and must be provided to representatives of the Regional Board or USEPA upon request. The most recent manure nutrient analysis must be provided to the manure haulers.

B. The Dischargers that overly the San Jacinto River Basin and the groundwater management zones located there must perform, or have performed on their behalf, groundwater monitoring of wells under their ownership or control to evaluate the potential impact of dairy operations on the underlying groundwater.

C. The Dischargers that are tributary to the Middle Santa Ana River must implement, or cause to be implemented on their behalf, the water quality monitoring plan approved by the Regional Board on June 29, 2007 in Resolution No. R8-2007-0046, as subsequently amended or revised.
1. The Discharger must submit, or cause to be submitted on their behalf, the results of the water quality monitoring to the Regional Board by May 31 of each year.

2. The results of the water quality monitoring must include an analysis designed to conclusively demonstrate achievement, or progress towards achievement, of the CAFO bacterial indicator waste load allocations pursuant to the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDLs.

3. If the analysis of the water quality monitoring results is inconclusive or reveals opportunities for improvements to the monitoring plan, the Discharger, in cooperation with other stakeholders, must include recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the monitoring program in the annual report.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements/Self-Monitoring Reports

1. The Discharger must comply with Standard Provisions (Attachment A) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.

2. At any time during the term of this Order, the State Board or the Regional Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit reports and notices required by this Order. Until such notification is given, the Discharger must submit a hard copy of the reports and notices.

3. By January 15 of each year, the Discharger must submit an Annual Report of all previous year activities at the facility. Annual Reports must be submitted as indicated below or using an electronic method, specified by the Executive Officer, after the Executive Officer notifies the Discharger to do so in a written Notice. The Annual Report must include the following:

   a. A cover letter that clearly identifies violations of the Order; discusses corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation;
   
   b. A completed Summary Report of Weekly Storm Water Management Structure Inspections Form (Form 2);
   
   c. Completed Annual Report Form (Form 3);
   
   d. Sampling and analyses results of any surface discharges and manure nutrient analyses;
   
   e. Confirmation that written permission from agricultural operators or landowners of cropland where the Discharger’s manure waste is applied is valid and in full effect.

Commented [PB36]: Not consistent with the rest of the permit. The current annual report and manure manifests require acknowledging that the sample results were provided to manure recipient, but those results are never part of the dairy’s file at RWQCB. Privacy concerns.

Commented [PB37]: Privacy issues of concern. Delete d & e
The Discharger’s confirmation that markers in containment structures are valid indicators of the required minimum capacity (See Section IV.A.).

The results of any nutrient analyses performed on manure that was transferred for agricultural use and

Completed Manure Tracking Manifest(s) (Form 4).

4. The Discharger must notify the Regional Board by telephone within 24 hours of any unauthorized discharge of wastes. This notification must be followed by a written report which must be submitted to the Regional Board within two weeks of the discharge. The written report must contain:

a. The approximate date and time of the discharge;

b. The estimated flow rate and duration of the discharge;

c. The specific type and source of the waste discharges (e.g., overflow from holding pond, rainfall runoff from manure storage areas, etc.); and

d. A time schedule and a plan to implement necessary corrective actions to prevent the recurrence of the discharge.

5. All reports must be signed by a responsible officer or duly authorized representative of the Discharger(s) and must be submitted under penalty of perjury.

A. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) (see Section A, above)

B. Other Reports (see Section A, above)

1. Alternate Reporting Strategy

Any Discharger who participates in the Manure Manifest System developed by the San Jacinto Basin Resource Conservation District (as per the Tetra Tech, Inc. report dated November 28, 2008), needs to submit only Form 2 and any analytical results of discharges to surface waters, provided that the information required under the Manure Manifest has been submitted to the San Jacinto Basin Resource Conservation District by January 15 of each year.

Commented (PB38): Delete this comment. This was never implemented. There was no grant to fund the work unfortunately.
Form 1: CAFO Weekly Storm Water Management Structure Inspections Log Sheet

Reporting Period: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Information (Please make corrections directly on this form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operator’s Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: Use this form to keep track of weekly visual inspections of your process wastewater and storm water containment structures. Document the findings of daily storm event inspections. List the structure items that need to be inspected below (refer to your Engineered Waste Management Plan).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Item 1</th>
<th>Structure Item 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keep track of your inspections in the following table by completing one row each week when you inspect your process wastewater and storm water containment structures. Provide the following information: date of inspection, initials of the person performing the inspection, check “OK” box if no problems were found, use the “Notes” column to describe problems, if you find any, and how they were fixed, record the estimate of the wastewater containment pond(s) freeboard, fill in the “Date Corrected” column with the date when you correct the problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Inspection</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Problems Described</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Date Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>OK(?)</td>
<td>Notes (Indicate any problems and how they were remedied.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**General Waste Discharge Requirements**

**Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations**

NPDES Permit No. CAG018001

Form 1

---

**Reporting Period:**

---

**Facility Name:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>OK(?)</th>
<th>Notes (Indicate any problems found and how they were remedied.)</th>
<th>Waste Pond Freeboard</th>
<th>Date Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reporting Period: 

Facility Name: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>OK(?)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Waste Pond Freeboard</th>
<th>Date Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>OK(?)</td>
<td>Notes (Indicate any problems found and how they were remedied.)</td>
<td>Waste Pond Freeboard</td>
<td>Date Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>OK(?)</td>
<td>Notes (Indicate any problems found and how they were remedied.)</td>
<td>Waste Pond Freeboard</td>
<td>Date Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>OK(?)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Waste Pond</td>
<td>Date Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Form 2: Summary Report of Weekly Storm Water Management Structure Inspections

**Reporting Period:** January 1, 20 through December 31, 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Information (Please make corrections directly on this form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operator’s Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the CAFO Weekly Storm Water Management Structure Inspections Log Sheet completed for the entire year? **Yes** □ **No** □

If **No**, please explain why the log sheet was not completed for the entire year.

---

Were water lines inspected daily? **Yes** □ **No** □

Were there any discharges from the facility during the year? **Yes** □ **No** □

If **Yes**, please provide: the date of discharge, how it was discovered (was it during a routine site inspection?), how long did the discharge last, and how it was stopped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of incident</th>
<th>How was it discovered?</th>
<th>How long did it last and volume?</th>
<th>How was it stopped?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

Name of person making this report (please print): ___________________________________________

Title: _______________________________________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________________________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________________________________________
Form 3: **ANNUAL REPORT FORM**

**Reporting Period:** January 1, 20 through December 31, 20

**Report Due Date:** January 15, 20

### FACILITY INFORMATION

(Please make any corrections directly on this form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAFO Operator’s Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFO Facility Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANIMAL POPULATION

(Please provide the number of animals in each category)

- Milking Cows
- Dry Cows
- Heifers
- Calves
- Others (specify type and number)

### MANURE INFORMATION

Units Used: Tons, Cubic Yards

- Manure Produced
- Manure Spread on Cropland at Facility
- Manure Spread on Other Cropland
- Manure Stockpiled on Site as of 12/31/
- Manure Hauled Away (Also provide Manure Tracking Manifests, Form 4)

**Was Manure Amount Calculated Using the Following Factors?**

- Yes
- No

1 Milking cow produces approximately 4.1 tons of manure per year
1 Dry cow produces approximately 4.1 tons of manure per year
1 Heifer produces approximately 1.5 tons of manure per year
1 Calf produces approximately 0.6 tons of manure per year

*1 ton of corral manure equals 2.32 cubic yards and 1 cubic yard of corral manure equals 0.43 tons*

### NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN (NMP) AND NUTRIENT ANALYSIS

- NMP is Certified
  - Yes
  - No

Has the most current nutrient analysis been provided to the recipient of the manure?

- Yes
- No

**Commented [PB39]:** Has caused confusion in the past. Should also include a "N/A" selection for dairies not required to have an NMP.

**Commented [PB40]:** Put this question under section above under Manure hauled away!

**Commented [PB41]:**

**Commented [PB41R40]:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROP GROWING ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of cropland acres where manure has been applied (Cropland is contiguous to the dairy, where manure was applied and a crop was harvested).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland acres: ___________  No. of plantings per year:  One__ Two__ Three__ Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of crops grown:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan grass____  Alfalfa____  Winter wheat____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley____  Bermuda grass____  corn____  Oats____  Turf Grass____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables____  Others____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual crop yields, ________________  ________________  ________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure application rates__________________  ________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of manure spread on each field__________________  ________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Milking per day (Dairies only):  One_____ Two_____ Three_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

Name of person making this report (please print):  
Signature: ___
Date: ___
Title: ___
**Form 4**

**Manure Tracking Manifest**

**INSTRUCTIONS:**
1. Complete one manifest for each hauling event and for each destination. A hauling event may last for several days, as long as the manure is being hauled to the same destination.
2. If there are multiple destinations, complete a separate form for each destination.
3. The CAFO operator must obtain the signature of the hauler upon completion of each manure hauling event.
4. The CAFO operator shall submit manure tracking manifest(s) with the Annual Report to Regional Board.

**OPERATOR’S INFORMATION**

CAFO Operator’s Name

CAFO Facility Name

Facility Address

Mailing Address

Telephone Number

**MANURE INFORMATION**

Manure analyzed for nutrients? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Most current nutrient analysis of manure provided to the recipient of the manure? [ ] Yes [ ] No

**MANURE HAULER INFORMATION**

Name and Address of Hauling Company

Contact Person Name:

Phone Number:

**MANURE DESTINATION INFORMATION**

Hauled to (please check):

- Composting Facility
- Regional Treatment Facility
- Croplands in Riverside County
- Croplands in San Bernardino County
- Croplands in other Counties

Amount removed: [ ] Tons or [ ] Cubic Yards

(Please enter the amount in the box below and circle the appropriate units)

Dates Hauled:

Destination of Haul:

Composting Facility

Regional Treatment Facility

Croplands in Riverside County

Croplands in San Bernardino County

GPS Coordinates of Destination:

Latitude: __________________________

Longitude: ________________________

Destination Receiver of Manure:

Manure Quantity Delivered: [ ]

Approximate Acreage (if Destination is Cropland): __________________________

Crop(s) Grown on Cropland: __________________________

**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.

Operator’s Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Hauler’s Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

1. The Regional Board may ask for a copy of manure nutrient analysis.
2. GPS coordinates shall be provided for all destinations within the Santa Ana Region

Commented [PB43]: Does the compost material then leave the watershed

Commented [PB44]: Add in out of state

Commented [PB45R44]:
ATTACHMENT C
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Santa Ana Region

NOTICE OF INTENT
TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE GENERAL PERMIT TO DISCHARGE
WASTES FROM CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS (DAIRIES AND RELATED FACILITIES)
(Order No. R8-2018-0001, NPDES No. CAG018001)

PERMITTEE (Person/Agency Responsible for Discharge)
Owner/Operator Name: ________________________________
Mailing Address: ________________________________
Contact Person: ______________________ Phone (___) ____________

FACILITY (Physical Address)
Name: ________________________________
Location: ________________________________
Contact Person: ______________________ Phone (___) ____________

FACILITY INFORMATION
Latitude: __________________ Longitude: __________________
Topographic Map of Facility ______ Yes ______ No
Total area (acres) ______ Cropland (acres) ______ Corrals (acres) ______
Disposal/Pasture (acres) ______ Number of acres contributing drainage ______

ANIMAL POPULATION (specify number)
Milking Cows ______ Dry Cows ______ Heifers ______
Calves ______ Other (specify type) ______

MANURE, LITTER AND/OR WASTEWATER PRODUCTION AND USE
How much manure, litter, and wastewater is produced annually? ______ tons ______ gallons
If land applied, how many acres of land under the control of permittee are available for applying
manure/litter/wastewater? __________________________ acres
How many tons of manure or litter or gallons of wastewater produced will be transferred annually to other
persons? ______ tons ______ gallons

TYPE OF CONTAINMENT AND CAPACITY
Holding Ponds (gallons) ________ Evaporation Ponds (gallons) ________
Lagoons (gallons) ________ Other (specify type) ________

(anno altri dettagli)
ATTACHMENT C  California Regional Water Quality Control Board  Santa Ana Region

TYPE OF STORAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Total number of days</th>
<th>Total capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Lagoon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Lagoon:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation Pond:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboveground Storage Tanks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belowground Storage Tanks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofted Storage Shed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pad:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Soil Pad:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN (NMP)

Will you comply with an existing, approved NMP for this facility?  ____ Yes  ____ No

Date of last approved review/revision of the NMP  Date:  ________________

Are you submitting a new or amended NMP for approval for this facility?  ____ Yes  ____ No

Is the new or amended NMP enclosed?  ____ Yes  ____ No

If no, please explain__________________________

ENGINEERED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN (EWMP)

Will you comply with an existing, approved EWMP for this facility?  ____ Yes  ____ No

Date of last approved review/revision of the EWMP Date:  ________________

Are you submitting a new or amended EWMP for approval for this facility?  ____ Yes  ____ No

Is the new or amended EWMP enclosed?  ____ Yes  ____ No

If no, please explain__________________________

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.

SIGNATURE OF OWNER OF FACILITY ____________________________

SIGNATURE OF OPERATOR OF FACILITY ____________________________

PRINT OR TYPE NAME ____________________________

PRINT OR TYPE NAME ____________________________

TITLE AND DATE ____________________________

TITLE AND DATE ____________________________
ATTACHMENT D

DRAFT FACT SHEET

For

General Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit, NPDES NO. CAG018001

For

Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (Dairies and Related Facilities)

Order No. R8-2018-0001
I. INTRODUCTION

This Fact Sheet provides the legal basis and the technical rationale for requirements specified in Order No. R8-2018-0001, General NPDES Permit No. CAG018001.

This Order has been prepared under a standardized format to accommodate a broad range of discharge requirements for dischargers in California. Unless a section or subsection of this Order is specifically identified as “not applicable”, the section or subsection is fully applicable to the Dischargers. Only those sections or subsections of this Order that are specifically identified as “not applicable” have been determined to not apply to the Dischargers.

II. FEDERAL CLEAN WATER ACT AND CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS (CAFOs)

The requirements specified in this Order are based on the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and its implementing regulations contained in the Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.); the California Water Code (Water Code) and its implementing regulations; and plans and policies adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board), including the Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (Basin Plan).

In 1972, the Clean Water Act established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program for point source discharges. Chapter 5.5, Division 7 of the California Water Code incorporates requirements necessary for the state to implement portions of the Clean Water Act, including the NPDES permit program. The State Board and the nine regional water quality control boards are the permitting authorities that administer the NPDES permit program in California with the approval of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

The NPDES program allows the permitting authority to issue a permit for the discharge of any pollutant or combination of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. § 1342(a)(1). The CWA prohibits the discharge of pollutants to surface waters. 33 U.S.C. § 1311. If a facility requests a permit, it can discharge in accordance with the permit conditions and will be treated as a discharge from a point source. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1342,1362(14).

It is appropriate to regulate CAFOs under an NPDES permit. Federal regulations define Animal Feeding Operations (AFOs) as operations where animals have been, are, or will be stabled or confined and fed or maintained for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month period, and where vegetation is not sustained in the confinement area during the normal growing season. 40 C.F.R. § 122.23(b)(1)(i). Federal regulations define a CAFO as any AFO that either meets a certain animal population threshold, or, regardless of population, is determined to be a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the United States by the appropriate authority. 40 C.F.R. § 122.23(b)(4) & (6). Section 502 of the CWA states that all CAFOs from which...
pollutants are or may be discharged are point sources and thus are subject to NPDES permitting requirements.

When considering designating an AFO as a CAFO, as the result of being a significant contributor of pollutants, the appropriate authority must consider certain factors. These factors include, in part, the location of the AFO relative to surface waters, the slope, rainfall and other factors that increase the likelihood or frequency of discharges, and the impact of the aggregate amount of waste discharged from multiple AFOs in the same geographic area.

The Regional Board, as the designated authority, has determined that it is appropriate to designate all AFOs with a herd size of more than 20 cows or 50 heifers or calves within the Region as significant sources of pollutants subject to waste discharge requirements. The discharge of wastes from the AFOs within the Region are to waterbodies that are tributary to the Santa Ana River or the San Jacinto River. Therefore, the acronym "CAFO" will be used to describe all facilities regulated under Order No. R8-2018-0001.

Water Code Section 13263(i) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.28 allow the Regional Board to issue general permits to regulate discharges of wastes that meet the following criteria.

a. Waste discharges involving the same or substantially similar types of operations;

b. Discharge the same types of wastes;

c. Require the same or similar operating conditions;

d. Require the same or similar monitoring; and

e. Are more appropriately regulated under a general permit rather than an individual permit.

The discharges regulated by Order No. R8-2018-0001 satisfy the criteria in 40 C.F.R. § 122.28 and the Water Code. As such, this Order is being issued as a general NPDES permit.


III. APPLICABLE FEDERAL AND STATE CAFO REGULATIONS

The USEPA enacted CAFO regulations in 1976, 2003, 2008, and 2012. The 1976, 2003 and the 2008 regulations were challenged in the U.S. District and/or Appellate courts. The revised CAFO regulations issued by the USEPA in 2003, 2008 and 2012 were in response to the various court decisions. On July 19, 2012, the USEPA issued its final rule revising the CAFO permit regulations. The CAFO regulations are contained in 40 C.F.R. §§122.21, 122.23, 122.28, 122.42, 122.62 and 412.
The 2003 rule required all CAFOs to apply for an NPDES permit whether or not they discharged unless a “no potential to discharge” determination was approved by the permitting authority. The Second Circuit court vacated the 2003 rule’s “duty to apply” and held that the permitting authority cannot require the CAFOs to apply for a permit based on a “potential to discharge.” In this decision, the Second Circuit upheld USEPA’s exclusion of agricultural storm water runoff from the NPDES permit requirements. This decision also indicated that the Nutrient Management Plans that were required under the 2003 rules were essentially “effluent limits” that required the permitting authority’s review to determine compliance with the permit.

On November 20, 2008, the USEPA published the 2008 rule that required among other things: (1) a Nutrient Management Plan with the NPDES permit application for any application of manure and/or process wastewater to cropland. The Plan must be incorporated into the permit as enforceable effluent limitations; and (2) all CAFOs that “propose to discharge” must apply for an NPDES permit unless a voluntary certification is made by the CAFO that the facility is designed, constructed, operated and maintained to prevent any discharge. This 2008 rule essentially established a “duty to apply” liability scheme. The 2008 rule was petitioned by a number of the industry groups.

These petitions were consolidated and on March 15, 2011, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit issued its ruling regarding the 2008 rule. It held that the USEPA has no authority to require a CAFO without a discharge to apply for an NPDES permit. Furthermore, the Court also invalidated the “duty to apply” liability scheme.

On July 19, 2012, USEPA issued its final rule to revise the CAFO permit regulation. In the 2012 rule, the USEPA removed the requirement that CAFOs that “propose to discharge” must seek NPDES permit coverage. This Order implements the federal CWA, USEPA regulations, and state laws and regulations applicable to CAFOs.

This General NPDES permit does not require CAFOs that do not discharge to surface waters to seek NPDES permit coverage. However, CAFO operations could adversely impact surface and groundwater quality. Those CAFOs that discharge pollutants to surface waters but do not get coverage under this General NPDES Permit, alternatively must obtain individual waste discharge requirements pursuant to state law. At the October 26, 2012 Regional Board meeting, Regional Board staff discussed the status of the dairy permit and the trade associations representing the CAFOs expressed their support for reissuance of the existing permit as a general NPDES permit.

Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 1 prescribes minimum standards for discharges of animal waste at confined animal facilities to protect both surface and ground water. Section 22562 of Title 27 also requires CAFOs to design and construct retention ponds to retain all facility wastewater generated, together with all precipitation on, and drainage through, manured areas during a 25-year, 24-hour storm. The retention ponds are to be lined with, or underlain by, soils which contain at least 10 percent clay and not more than 10 percent gravel or artificial materials of equivalent impermeability. Title 27, section 22562(d). In addition, there are flood protection requirements for CAFOs. Title 27, section 22562(c).
IV. DAIRY WASTES AND THEIR IMPACTS ON WATER QUALITY

According to Regional Board records of Annual Reports submitted for the 2017 reporting period, there are approximately 109 dairy related AFOs in the Santa Ana Region. Of these, 84 are in the Santa Ana River Basin and 25 are in the San Jacinto River Basin. There are approximately 126,000 animals on dairy facilities in the Region. These animals consist of 67,000 milking cows; 11,400 dry cows; 31,500 heifers; 13,000 calves; and 3,100 others (beef cows, bulls, horses, etc.).

CAFO operations produce wastes consisting of manure and urine excreted by the animals, wastewater from the milk barn, litter and storm water runoff through manured areas. These wastes generally contain high levels of bacteria; nutrients (including nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and ammonia compounds); salts (total dissolved solids, TDS); hormones; and biochemical and chemical oxygen demands (indicators of decomposable materials).

A study conducted by the University of California Committee of Experts for the Central Valley Region recommends using an average nitrogen excretion rate of 462 grams/head/day for lactating cows and 195 grams/head/day for dry cows. An adult cow typically spends 305 days per year lactating and 60 days per year dry. Therefore, 1,000 adult cows will produce approximately 339,000 pounds (169.5 tons) of nitrogen per year. Between 20% and 40% of nitrogen from wastewater and manure in storage lagoons and corrals is emitted to the atmosphere as ammonia. Additional emissions will occur as part of land application of wastewater and manure.

In addition to nitrogen, the average adult dairy cow will excrete 427 pounds per year of salts as sodium, potassium, and chloride. The total excreted salts are typically 50% higher and up to 100% higher than the combination of sodium, potassium and chloride. Assuming typical conditions of 50%, 1,000 adult cows will produce approximately 641,000 pounds (320 tons) of salt per year in addition to nitrogen. Unlike nitrogen, no losses occur with these salts in the handling of manure or wastewater.

If nutrients and decomposable materials from the CAFOs enter waterways, they can deplete dissolved oxygen which could adversely impact aquatic life. High bacteria levels could impact recreational activities and ammonia could cause aquatic toxicity. Bacteria, salts and nitrates in the dairy wastes could infiltrate into groundwater from waste containment facilities. In groundwater, nitrate levels can increase to unhealthy levels, which can cause Blue Baby Syndrome, a potentially fatal blood disorder, if the water is consumed.

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
Dairies also produce atmospheric emissions. Dairy wastewater is generally stored in waste storage lagoons or other containment structures. Bacterial decomposition of wastes in the storage lagoons also produces methane and ammonia gas. This Order does not regulate the operation of new sources of atmospheric emissions.

Discharges to waters of the U.S. from the CAFOs can occur in storm water runoff from the production area or from the land application area. Discharges to groundwater can occur in wastewater and precipitation that percolates into the soil underlying waste containment structures and waste stockpiles at the facility. Proper management of wastes from CAFOs is essential to protect surface and groundwater resources of the Region. If left unregulated, these discharges of wastes in storm water runoff and wastewater from CAFOs in the Chino Basin (Chino-North, Chino-East, and Chino-South Groundwater Management Zones) have a potential to affect Chino Creek, Mill Creek and Reach 3 of the Santa Ana River. Pursuant to CWA section 303(d), these surface waterbodies are listed as impaired due, in part, to bacterial indicators.

The Chino Basin was once considered to have the highest concentration of dairy animals in the world, with approximately 350 dairies and over 300,000 animals. During the past 20 years, however, the dairies have been steadily leaving this area. According to the dairy operators' 2017 annual reports, there are currently 84 facilities in the Chino Basin with a total of 78,000 animals. Although the waste loading from the dairies has decreased significantly, historic application of manure and process wastewater to the ground in the Chino Basin has resulted the accumulation of salts in the underlying soils and groundwater. The result has been significant groundwater degradation, specifically due to high levels of total dissolved solids (TDS) and nitrate.

There are an additional 25 CAFO facilities in the San Jacinto River Basin, with a total of 48,000 animals. Wastes from CAFOs in the San Jacinto River Basin have a potential to affect the San Jacinto River, Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore if left unregulated. Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore are included on the CWA section 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies due to nutrients. Nitrate and phosphorus from various sources, including CAFOs, is considered to be the primary cause of algae blooms in Lake Elsinore, the largest natural freshwater lake in Southern California. These algae blooms deplete oxygen in the lake, creating fish kills and other conditions that affect the recreational uses of the lake and aesthetics of the area. Excessive nutrient discharges to Canyon Lake have also resulted in algae blooms and reduced oxygen levels.

Prior to 1994, Regional Board's regulatory approach was to issue individual waste discharge requirements. However, frequent changes in the herd size, location, and operators or owners of such facilities combined with the related demand for permit rescission and issuance far exceeded the available staff resources. Therefore, in 1994, the Regional Board adopted Order No. 94-7, the first general NPDES for these facilities. Order No. 94-7 was replaced by Order No. 99-11 which was later replaced by Order No. R8-2013-0001. Order No. R8-2013-0001 expired on June 1, 2018. Adoption

---

4 Land application area is any area under the control of a CAFO owner or operator where manure, bedding, or process water is applied. 40 C.F.R. § 122.23(b)(3).
V. PERMIT COVERAGE/NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The purpose of this Order is to regulate the discharge of pollutants from CAFOs so that the water quality standards of receiving waters are attained and maintained. To obtain coverage under this Order, the Discharger must submit a completed Notice of Intent (NOI) form, an Engineered Waste Management Plan (EWMP) for all facilities where the herd is kept, a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) if the facility is proposing to apply CAFO biomass to cropland owned or controlled by the Discharger, and the first annual fee. All facilities currently regulated under Order No. R8-2013-0001 have approved EWMPs and NMPs (where applicable). These plans need to be updated only if there are substantial changes in its operations that affect the Discharger’s ability to comply with this Order or if the Discharger does not intend to implement them.

VI. DISCHARGE DESCRIPTION

(See Section IV, above)

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls [Not Applicable]

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

The CAFO facilities within the Region are located either within the Santa Ana River Basin or the San Jacinto River Basin. Discharges from these facilities could impact Santa Ana River and its tributaries, San Jacinto River, Canyon Lake, Lake Elsinore and the groundwater management zones within these areas.

C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data

Order No. R8-2013-0001, which this Order replaces, prohibited discharges to surface waters other than from facilities designed and maintained to contain process wastewater, including runoff and direct precipitation resulting from a 25-year, 24-hour storm event, or equivalent. In addition, Order No. R8-2013-0001 required the Dischargers to develop and implement an EWMP and an NMP, where applicable. The Dischargers were also required to submit an Annual Report.

D. Compliance Summary

The Annual Reports submitted by the Dischargers indicate that the CAFOs within the Region are mostly in compliance with the permit requirements.
The Dischargers have submitted EWMPs and those who land-apply CAFO biomass have also submitted their NMPs.

**E. Planned Changes**

Any change in ownership of the facility and changes in the herd size, treatment and containment systems and cropland acreage could trigger a need to update the EWMPs and the NMPs.

**VII. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

**A. Legal Authorities**

(See Sections II and III for applicable state and federal laws and regulations)

**B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

This Order is both an NPDES permit, issued pursuant to federal law, and waste discharge requirements (WDRs), pursuant to State law. This Order only regulates existing facilities that are currently regulated under the 2013 General Permit (Order No. R8-2013-0001). California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15301 exempts existing facilities from CEQA requirements.

Furthermore, the action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21000-21177, under Water Code Section 13389. Requirements for “new sources” as defined in Section 306 of the CWA are not covered by the exemption. A “new source” must demonstrate that it qualifies as an existing facility under the CEQA Guidelines to be considered for coverage under this Order.

Food and Agricultural Code Section 33487 exempts state agencies from any requirement to prepare a CEQA document for CAFOs under the following circumstances: (1) when the dairy will be constructed and operated in accordance with the minimum standards in Chapter 5 of the Food and Agricultural Code; (2) where the applicable local agencies have completed all necessary reviews and approvals including that required by CEQA; and (3) where a permit for construction was issued by a local agency on or after the effective date of Food and Agricultural Code section 33487 and construction has begun.

As such, the issuance of this Order complies with CEQA requirements.

**C. Basin Plan**

The Regional Board adopted a revised Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana Region (Basin Plan) that became effective on January 24, 1995 (Resolution No. 94-1). The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters in the Santa Ana Region. Sections I.M.30 and 31 of the Order list the
designated beneficial uses of the receiving waters that could be impacted by the CAFO discharges.

On January 22, 2004, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. R8-2004-0001, amending the existing Basin Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin. The amendment (TDS/Nitrogen Basin Plan Amendment) included revised groundwater sub-basin boundaries (now called groundwater management zones), revised TDS and nitrate-nitrogen quality objectives for groundwater, revised TDS and nitrogen waste load allocations (WLAs) and changes to specific surface water objectives. The changes to surface water objectives include revised TDS and nitrogen objectives, revised reach designations and revised beneficial use designations. This Order implements relevant provisions of the approved N/TDS Basin Plan Amendment.

As part of the update of the TDS/Nitrogen Management plan in the Basin Plan, the Chino Basin Watermaster and the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) proposed that alternative, less stringent TDS and/or nitrate-nitrogen water quality objectives be adopted for the Chino-North and Cucamonga Groundwater Management Zones. These proposals were based on additional consideration of the factors specified in Water Code section 13241 and the requirements of the State’s antidegradation policy (State Board Resolution No. 68-16). Since the less stringent objectives would allow a lowering of water quality, the aforementioned agencies were required to demonstrate that their proposed objectives would protect beneficial uses, and that water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state would be maintained.

Appropriate beneficial use protection/maximum benefit demonstrations were made by the Chino Basin Watermaster/Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) to justify alternative “maximum benefit” objectives for the Chino-North and Cucamonga Groundwater Management Zones. These “maximum benefit” proposals entail commitments by the agencies to implement specific projects and programs. While these agencies’ efforts to develop these proposals indicate their interest to proceed with these commitments, unforeseen circumstances may impede or preclude progress. To address this possibility, the 2004 Basin Plan Amendment includes both the “antidegradation” and “maximum benefit” objectives for the subject waters. Fulfillment of the commitments by the agencies equates to maximum benefit, and the “maximum benefit” objectives included in the Basin Plan Amendment for these waters apply for regulatory purposes. Failure to fulfill the commitments, as determined by the Regional Board in its discretion, means that the prerequisite “maximum benefit” has not been provided and that accordingly the “antidegradation” objectives for these waters will apply. To date, these agencies have been implementing the commitments necessary to demonstrate maximum benefit, so the maximum benefit water quality objectives apply for regulatory purposes of this Order.

The application of the “maximum benefit” objectives relies on implementation of a specific program of projects and requirements, which are a part of the Chino Basin Optimum Basin Management Program (OBMP), by the Chino Basin Watermaster and the IEUA. The OBMP was developed by the Watermaster under the supervision of the
San Bernardino County Superior Court. The OBMP is a comprehensive, long-range water management plan for the Chino Basin, including the Chino-North and Cucamonga Groundwater Management Zones. The OBMP includes the use of recycled water for basin recharge, initially in the Chino-North Groundwater Management Zone. The OBMP also includes the capture and recharge of increased quantities of storm water runoff, recharge of imported water when its TDS concentrations are low, improvement of water supply by desalting poor quality groundwater, and enhanced wastewater pollutant source control programs. The OBMP seeks to provide enhanced yield for the Chino Basin and to provide reliable water supplies for development expected to occur within the Basin. The OBMP also includes management activities that would result in the hydraulic isolation of Chino Basin groundwater from the Orange County Management Zone, thus insuring the protection of downstream beneficial uses and water quality. Wastewater discharges and some manure from CAFOs in the Chino Basin have been factored into the OBMP.

Order No. 99-11 was adopted by the Regional Board with a prohibition on the disposal of manure in the Chino Basin through land application. The use of manure as a fertilizer was also prohibited in the Chino Basin “unless a plan, acceptable to the Executive Officer, is implemented which mitigates the effects of that use on the underlying groundwater sub-basin”. This prohibition was necessitated in part by the lack of assimilative capacity of the underlying groundwater and by the lack of progress in developing a program to offset salt loading from dairies.

Shortly after adopting Order No. 99-11, the Regional Board adopted Cease and Desist Order (CDO) No. 99-65. CDO No. 99-65 modified the prohibition in Order No. 99-11 to allow the land application of manure at agronomic rates provided that progress was being made “toward the construction and operation of a second desalter within the Chino Basin”. Among other things, CDO No. 99-65 established time schedules for the affected Dischargers to comply with other requirements of Order No. 99-11.

When the maximum benefit objectives were adopted by the Regional Board with Resolution No. 2004-0001, they effectively created assimilative capacity in the groundwater management zones where the remaining dairies are located. This assimilative capacity, as noted above, is generally conditioned upon the success of the OBMP. Among its accomplishments, the OBMP has since resulted in the construction and operation of a second desalter in the Chino Basin. This second desalter, along with the assimilative capacity, allowed the Regional Board to approve nutrient management plans for dairies in the Chino Basin shortly after the General CAFO Permit, Order No. 2007-0001, was adopted.

D. National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR). [Not applicable]

USEPA adopted the National Toxics Rule (NTR) on December 22, 1992, and later amended it on May 4, 1995 and November 9, 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On May 18, 2000, USEPA adopted the California Toxics Rule (CTR). The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on February 13, 2001. The CTR and NTR contain water
quality criteria for priority pollutants in discharges to surface water. However, the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Implementation Policy or SIP) states that the Policy does not apply to regulation of storm water discharges. The Regional Board believes that compliance with Water Quality Standards through implementation of BMPs is appropriate for regulating dairy discharges. The USEPA articulated this position on the use of BMPs in storm water permits in the policy memorandum entitled, “Interim Permitting Approach for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in Storm Water Permits” (61 FR 43761, August 9, 1996). The USEPA also has articulated this position with respect to implementing TMDLs in their policy memorandum entitled Establishing Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) for Storm Water Sources and NPDES Permit Requirements Based on those WLAs, November 22, 2002. This Order is consistent with the SIP and the USEPA’s November 22, 2002 memorandum.

E. State Implementation Policy. [Not Applicable]

(See Section D above)

F. Alaska Rule

(See Finding I.X.41. of the Order)

G. Antidegradation Policy

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 requires that State water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California’s antidegradation policy in State Board Resolution 68-16, which incorporates the requirements of the federal antidegradation policy. Resolution 68-16 requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings.

The federal anti-degradation policy as set forth in 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 and the state’s antidegradation policy as set forth in State Board Resolution No. 68-16, “Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California” are applicable to NPDES permitting process, including permit renewals. The federal policy only applies to surface water quality and it protects existing beneficial uses, includes special provisions for waters designated as an “outstanding natural resource” and establishes baseline water quality as the best water quality that existed since the adoption of the policy in 1975.

The State anti-degradation policy is more inclusive. It is applicable to both surface and groundwaters; incorporates the federal policy, protects existing and reasonable potential beneficial uses and establishes the baseline water quality as the best water quality that existed since 1968, unless subsequent lowering was due to regulatory action consistent with Resolution No. 68-16.
The state has developed guidance for the implementation of its anti-degradation policy in the Administrative Procedures Manual, APU Number 90-004 and in a February 16, 1995 Questions and Answers document. The USEPA has provided guidance through its “Questions and Answers on Antidegradation” and Guidance on implementing the Antidegradation Provisions of 40 C.F.R. § 131.12. The State Board also published an October 7, 1987 legal memorandum, “Federal Antidegradation Policy.” The following antidegradation analysis is based on these regulations and guidance documents.

An antidegradation analysis is required if the proposed action (in this case renewal of the NPDES permit) causes a lowering of water quality in “high quality” receiving waters. “High quality waters” are those where the baseline water quality is better than the prescribed water quality objective. The baseline water quality is the best quality of the receiving water that has existed since 1968, minus any degradation due to regulatory action consistent with state and federal anti-degradation policies.

Based on the water quality objectives and the existing water quality, there are three tiers to be considered with respect to water quality objectives and existing water quality in applying federal antidegradation principles:

1. Tier I: Existing water quality is lower than the water quality objectives.
2. Tier II: Where the baseline water quality is better than the water quality objectives (high quality waters).
3. Tier III: Specially designated as “Outstanding National Resource Waters” (there are no Tier 3 waters within the Santa Ana Region; Lake Tahoe and Mono Lake are the two Tier III waterbodies in California).

For Tier I (where the existing water quality is lower that the water quality objectives) or Tier III (outstanding national resource waters) waterbodies, if the proposed discharge causes a lowering of the existing water quality, that discharge should be prohibited.

For Tier II (high quality waters, where the baseline water quality is better than the prescribed water quality objective), any lowering of water quality has to be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state.

Generally, a lowering of water quality is triggered by:

1. New discharges;
2. Expansion of existing facilities;
3. Reduction in the level of treatment for an existing discharge;
4. Relocation of outfalls; and/or

---

8 http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/npdes/docs/apu_90_004.pdf
10 Available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/npdes/docs/apu_90_004.pdf
11 All these documents are available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/npdes/docs/apu_90_004.pdf (Some of the State Board decisions related to antidegradation is also available at this website.)
5. Substantial increases in mass emissions of pollutants.

For high quality waters, if a discharge of waste would lower the baseline water quality, then antidegradation requirements must be met. Resolution 68-16 establishes a two-step process to comply with the policy. In the first step, an antidegradation analysis should demonstrate: (1) beneficial uses would continue to be protected; (2) the established water quality objectives would be met; and (3) any lowering of water quality would be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of California. In the second step, any discharges to high quality waters must implement best practicable treatment or control to assure that a pollution or nuisance will not occur and to assure the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of California. Best practicable treatment or control means levels that can be achieved using best efforts and reasonable control methods.

The proposed Order does not permit new discharges; the level of waste treatment required under the proposed Order is not any less stringent than the existing Order; the outfalls are not being relocated; and the Order does not authorize any increases in mass emissions of pollutants. In fact, there is approximately a 25% reduction in the mass emissions from the previously permitted discharges due to a reduction in the total number of animals at the dairies.

This Order covers only existing facilities. Although these facilities may change ownership and the herd size may vary, the overall waste load is not increasing. The waste load has been steadily decreasing as these operators relocate their facilities outside of the Region. It is anticipated that this trend will continue. The proposed Order merely renews the general NPDES permit for existing dairies within the Santa Ana Region. It is not applicable to any new facilities.

Order No. R8-2013-0001, the existing NPDES permit for the CAFOs in the Region, regulated 127 CAFO facilities with a total animal population of 172,000. According to Annual Reports submitted by the dairy operators for 2017, the number of CAFOs has been reduced to 109 and the total animal population has reduced to 126,000. Any new discharges that will result in additional waste loads will not be able to seek coverage under this general permit. Those discharges will need to be addressed under an individual permit and an appropriate antidegradation analysis may need to be conducted at that time.

There are no high-quality waters in the San Jacinto Watershed, and as such the antidegradation policy does not apply to discharges in that area. Dischargers in the San Jacinto Watershed are required to meet the applicable water quality objectives, or more stringent limitations if such limitations could be met by the use of "best efforts."

A full antidegradation analysis may not be necessary in this case for the following reasons.

1. The permit is only applicable to existing facilities. There is no reason to believe that existing water quality will be lowered due to the proposed action, namely
renewal of an existing NPDES permit for a reduced number of existing facilities. There is a substantial reduction in the number of animals and consequently in the mass emissions of pollutants. As such, the discharges from the existing CAFOs are not expected to lower water quality in the receiving waters. According to APU 90-004, “if the Regional Board has no reason to believe that existing water quality will be reduced due to the proposed action, no antidegradation analysis is required.” (APU 90-004, Page 2).

2. With respect to surface waters, a discharge is allowed only in case of severe storm events (25-year, 24-hour storm or higher intensity storms). Therefore, any reduction in water quality from such a discharge will be temporary and will not result in any long-term deleterious effects on water quality as the discharges will cease after the storm event. (APU 90-004, Page 2, Item 2). No antidegradation analysis is required.

3. The CAFOs regulated by this Order are located either within the upper Santa Ana Basin (Chino Basin) or the San Jacinto Watershed. During the adoption of the water quality objectives for some of the groundwater management zones within these basins, a maximum benefit analysis was conducted for the Chino North and San Jacinto upper pressure groundwater management zones. The maximum benefit programs include implementation strategies for the Chino Basin and the San Jacinto upper pressure groundwater management zones that are outlined in Tables 5-8a and 5-11, respectively, of the Basin Plan. The Chino Basin Optimum Basin Management Program and Hemet/San Jacinto Water Management Plan are designed to address water quality problems from various types of discharges into these groundwater management zones. The Program and Plan have been approved by their respective agencies and have been adequately subjected to environmental and economic analyses in an environmental impact report. The Program and Plan consider all discharges and offset programs to prevent water quality degradation and/or to restore water quality. As such, a separate analysis is not necessary during this permit renewal process.\(^\text{12}\).

\(^\text{12}\) State Water Resources Control Board. Administrative Procedures Update No. 90-004, effective date: July 2, 1990 (p 2, Item 4).
The CAFOs regulated by this Order are located within the following groundwater management zones (see Table 1, below):

### Table 1
Location of Dairies and the Respective Groundwater Management Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater Management Zone</th>
<th>Number of Dairies</th>
<th>Max Benefit?</th>
<th>High Quality Water?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto Upper Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes¹³</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto Lower Pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview/Hemet North</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menifee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsinore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino North</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes for TDS. No for NO³-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado Basin (Wetland)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The table above only identifies high quality waters that are listed in the Basin Plan.)

Table 1 indicates that 86 dairies in the region are located within a groundwater management zone for which a complete “maximum benefit analysis”, including anti-degradation analysis, has been completed. The Chino Basin Optimum Basin Management Program includes specific programs and projects that the Chino Basin Watermaster and the Inland Empire Utilities Agency are required to implement. The Optimum Basin Management Program also considered waste discharges from the CAFOs in Chino Basin. The dairies that are located within other groundwater management zones are prohibited from discharging wastes into those basins that would lower the water quality unless a program is being developed that would offset all discharges of waste exceeding the water quality objective.

There are a number of operating and proposed offset programs to address salt and nutrient problems in the groundwaters of the region. In the Chino Basin area, there are two desalters operated by the Chino Basin Desalter Authority. The Chino Basin

¹³The Regional Board approved the Maximum Benefit Analysis for this groundwater management zone; other approvals are pending for this Analysis.
Desalter Authority is a Joint Exercise of Powers Agency formed between Jurupa Community Services District, the Santa Ana River Water Company, the Cities of Chino, Chino Hills, Norco and Ontario, Western Municipal Water District and the Inland Empire Utilities Agency. The Chino Desalters pump groundwater from lower Chino Basin, purify it through reverse osmosis or ion exchange processes, and distribute the product water to member agencies. The brine wastes from the treatment processes are discharged into a regional brine line where they are ultimately conveyed to the ocean. Chino Desalter I extracts groundwater from 14 wells and has a treatment capacity of 14.2 million gallons per day. Chino Desalter II pumps water from 8 wells and has a capacity of 10 million gallons per day. The Regional Board considers these desalters as acceptable offset projects for waste discharges to the various groundwater management zones where the CAFO facilities are located.

The CAFO facilities within the Chino Basin area, represented by the Chino Basin Overlying Agricultural Pool, are signatories to an agreement: “Agreement Regarding an Alternative Water Supply Source for the Replenishment Obligation of the Chino Basin Desalter”, July 10, 1996. This is an agreement between the Regional Board, the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Chino Basin Appropriative Pool, the Chino Basin Overlying (Agricultural) Pool and the Chino Basin (Non-Agricultural) Pool. This agreement mandates salt offset requirements on the Overlying Agricultural Pool members.

The Arlington Desalter extracts and treats groundwater from the Arlington Groundwater Management Zone. There are no operating dairies that impact this Zone.

Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern) operates two desalters in the San Jacinto watershed: (1) Perris I; and (2) Menifee. These facilities have a combined capacity of 8 million gallons per day. Eastern is also proposing to construct another desalter, Perris II, with a design capacity of 5.4 million gallons per day.

On behalf of the CAFO operators in the San Jacinto Basin, the Western Riverside County Agriculture Coalition has submitted a Dairy Salt Offset Proposal to Eastern Municipal Water District14. The proposed Order requires the Dischargers to participate in the offset programs for any discharge of wastes in excess of the water quality objectives to these basins as further discussed in Section VII.

The second step of an anti-degradation analysis, the Regional Board must consider best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) of the discharge necessary to avoid a pollution or nuisance and to maintain the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State. In considering BPTC, costs for the treatment or control should be considered. The analysis must compare the proposed method to existing proven technology; evaluate performance data, and compare alternative methods of treatment or control. The Regional Board must also consider USEPA-promulgated best available technology economically achievable.

---

14 Dairy Salt Offset Proposal to EMWD, by the Western Riverside County Agriculture Coalition (by Pat Boldt, WRCAC Executive Director)
(BAT). The USEPA had not promulgated any BAT that is applicable to groundwater protection for the CAFOs. Nevertheless, the state’s Anti-Degradation Policy applies to both surface and groundwater.

The proposed Order requires the Dischargers to continue to maintain and properly operate the existing waste containment structures. One option to ensure groundwater protection from these waste ponds is to fully line these ponds with impermeable liners, such as high-density polyethylene liners (HDPE) or clay liners. Regional Board staff has considered cost estimates for projects within the region.

Approximately ten years ago, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) sued Glenn Gorzeman Dairy and entered into a settlement agreement that included stipulations for lining the dairy’s ponds. According to information provided by Mr. Gorzeman to Board staff, the total cost of the liner installation was approximately $200,000. Mr. Gorzeman indicated that, due to the financial burden from this requirement, the dairy could not continue in business. The dairy discontinued its operations within two to three years of lining the ponds.

Western United Dairymen indicated that the approximate cost of HDPE liners today is $100,000 to $200,000 (depending upon the size of the ponds) and the additional cost of cleaning the existing ponds and lining them would be from $100,000 to $150,000. Consequently, the total cost of retrofitting the existing ponds with liners (or installing new ponds with liners) would be from $200,000 to $350,000.

A cost estimate of liners was conducted by Washington State University. The cost of constructing a lagoon with a liner and, if native soil is unsuitable to support the liner, imported fill, ranges between $90,000 to $625,000. This cost does not include the cost of cleaning existing lagoons and regrading.

The dairies are currently under financial distress and uncertainty due to global competition for commodities, fluctuation in global demand, and reduced federal price supports. The added cost of such a regulatory requirement would force many dairies to entirely discontinue their operations. This would have economic impacts such as loss of local and state jobs, energy and environmental concerns related to long distance hauling of dairy products, and loss of tax revenue for local municipalities.

For reasons explained above, the Dischargers’ participation in the salt offset programs should be considered as best practicable controls under the circumstances. The dairies are also implementing other control measures such as

---

reduced application of manure and process wastewater to cropland according to their Nutrient Management Plans and better control of source water through substitution of low-quality groundwater with higher-quality recycled water. These controls are being implemented and carefully monitored to ensure water quality protection.

The Chino Basin Watermaster, the Inland Empire Utilities Agency, Eastern Municipal Water District, Western Municipal Water District and other water purveyors and stakeholders in the region carry out regular monitoring of the groundwater management zones indicated in Table 1, above, and other groundwater management zones within the region. These are watershed-based comprehensive monitoring programs.

During the triennial review of the Basin Plan, all the monitoring information that is generated is considered to determine water quality trends. These triennial reviews include a comprehensive review of all monitoring data using sophisticated computer modeling programs. The implementation plan in the Basin Plan describes actions by various entities necessary to enhance and/or maintain water quality in the region. The triennial review also considers the existing control measures and evaluates the need for any additional control measures to ensure continued protection of water quality consistent with the adopted water quality objectives. These monitoring programs, control measures and continued evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs should ensure protection of ground and surface water quality in the region.

The monitoring programs, control measures and offset programs described above should ensure that any degradation of high quality waters is consistent with the antidegradation policies, that there is no degradation of other groundwater management zones, and any degradation of surface waters will be temporary and will not result in any long-term deleterious effects.

A technical report, Addressing Nitrate in California’s Drinking Waters, was submitted to the Legislature in February 2013\(^\text{19}\). The report was based on a study conducted by the University of California, Davis with a focus on Tulare Lake Basin and Salinas Valley Groundwater. The report describes recommendations to address nitrate in groundwater. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board has been implementing a number of the recommendations. One of the recommendations (Recommendation 6) in this Report is for the Water Boards to define and identify nitrate high-risk areas in order to prioritize regulatory oversight and assistance efforts in these areas. The Santa Ana Regional Board has been implementing such a program. The proposed Order requires participation in groundwater monitoring and reporting programs under Section IV.J. designed to continue such identification and remedial activities.

As discussed above, the discharges covered by this Order are not permitted to adversely affect water quality and therefore are consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 and State Board Resolution No. 68-16.

---

H. Anti-Backsliding Requirements

Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. Federal regulations limit the circumstances under which modified or reissued NPDES permits may set less stringent effluent limitations than required by previous permits. 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.44(1), 122.62. The Water Quality Act of 1987 includes provisions intended to clarify the Clean Water Act's anti-backsliding requirements. Clean Water Act § 402(o), 33 U.S.C. §1342(o).

The anti-backsliding provisions generally prohibit relaxation of effluent limitations previously established on the basis of best professional judgment. CWA § 402(o)(J); 33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(l). But the prohibition does not apply if any of five listed exceptions is applicable. CWA § 402(o)(2), 33 U.S.C. § 1342(o)(2). These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. Other standards and conditions (such as monitoring requirements) must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, unless there is a material and substantial change in circumstances that would constitute cause under 40 C.F.R. § 122.62. 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(l). As described below, all effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as those in the previous Order.

The Dischargers in the Prado Basin Management Zone were required to demonstrate that the Chino Basin Optimum Basin Management Program addressed the discharges from the CAFOs. The Chino Basin Optimum Basin Management Program includes specific programs and projects that the Chino Basin Watermaster and the Inland Empire Utilities Agency are required to implement in collaboration with other entities. These programs are being implemented by these agencies. Order No. R8-2007-0001 required the Dischargers to develop and submit a plan. There were 14 CAFOs located in this area at the time the 2007 Order was adopted. These CAFOs developed and submitted a plan as required; however, there is now only one active dairy in the Prado Basin Management Zone.

Order No. R8-2013-0001 prohibited the discharge of wastes from the CAFOs containing TDS and/or nitrogen concentrations in excess of the underlying groundwater management zone objectives for those constituents unless adequately offset to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer. The CAFO dischargers, in collaboration with other stakeholders in the area, have implemented salt and nutrient offset programs and other control measures consistent with the 2013 Permit requirements. This Order requires the Dischargers to continue to implement those programs, evaluate their effectiveness, and to participate in the monitoring programs to ensure that the control measures that are being implemented are protective of water quality objectives. These requirements are fully explained in Section VIII of the Fact Sheet and they are at least as stringent as the 2013 Permit requirements. As such, the provisions in the 2013 Permit are consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements.
I. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List and TMDL Implementation

The CAFO facilities within the Region are located either in the Santa Ana River or the San Jacinto River watersheds. Waste discharges from the CAFOs have a potential to impact the Santa Ana River, Reach 3, Chino Creek, Cucamonga Creek/Mill Creek, Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake, which are listed as impaired, under Section 303(d) of the CWA. The Santa Ana River, Reach 3, is impaired due to pathogens (bacteria); Chino Creek and Cucamonga/Mill Creek are impaired due to pathogens and nutrients; Lake Elsinore is impaired due to nutrients, and toxic constituents; and Canyon Lake is impaired due to pathogens and nutrients.

Federal regulations require that a total maximum daily load (TMDL) be established for 303(d) listed waterbodies for each pollutant of concern. The Regional Board adopted TMDLs for indicator bacteria for Middle Santa Ana River Watershed and nutrient TMDLs for Canyon Lake/Lake Elsinore. Federal regulation requires NPDES permits to include effluent limits that are “consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any available waste load allocation (WLA) for the discharge.” 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B). The following is a detailed discussion of the WLAs and TMDLs and how this Order implements the approved TMDLs.

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(k)(3), best management practices are the tools used to implement the TMDLs in this Order. The tasks identified below are based on the TMDL implementation plans. These tasks were identified during the development of the TMDLs as necessary steps to meet the WLAs specified in the TMDLs by the deadlines specified in the TMDLs.

1. Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Bacterial Indicator TMDLs

Pursuant to the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Bacterial Indicator TMDLs (Resolution No. R8-2005-0001), the following WLAs apply to CAFO facilities in the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed that drain, directly or indirectly, to Chino Creek, Cucamonga/Mill Creek and/or the Santa Ana River, Reach 3. The allocations apply to these CAFO facilities as a group.

a. Dry Summer Conditions: April 1 through October 31, compliance needs to be achieved as soon as possible, but no later than December 31, 2015.

   Escherichia coli WLA
   5–sample/30–day Logarithmic Mean less than 113 organisms/ 100mL, and
   not more than 10% of the samples exceed 212 organisms/100mL for any 30–
   day period.

   These WLAs are applicable to dry weather conditions. The Order prohibits any discharge of wastes to surface waters during dry weather conditions. Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.47(a)(1) state, “Any schedules for compliance under this section shall require compliance as soon as possible, but not later than the applicable statutory deadline under the CWA.” As such, the Order requires immediate compliance with the above WLAs.
b. **Wet Winter Conditions:** November 1 through March 31, compliance needs to be achieved as soon as possible, but no later than December 31, 2025.

\[ Escherichia \textit{coli} \ WLA \]
5–sample/30–day Logarithmic Mean less than 113 organisms/100mL, and not more than 10% of the samples exceed 212 organisms/100mL for any 30–day period.

The Order includes specific implementation activities, source controls, monitoring requirements, and annual progress reports. Since the final compliance date is beyond the expiration date of this Permit, these interim measures are designed to meet the WLAs by the schedules specified in the TMDLs. In addition to the CAFOs, there are other stakeholders who are collaborating in the implementation of this TMDL. A number of these tasks are collaborative efforts of all stakeholders.

c. **TMDL Monitoring Requirements and Control Measures**

1) **Watershed-wide Bacterial Indicator TMDL Water Quality Monitoring Program:**

Pursuant to Task 3 of the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Bacterial Indicator TMDLs, CAFO facilities were required to propose a watershed-wide monitoring program that will provide data necessary to review and update the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDLs by November 30, 2007. Data to be collected and analyzed were to be used to determine compliance with the TMDLs and WLAs for bacterial indicators.

On behalf of specific dischargers named in the Bacterial Indicator TMDLs, including CAFO operators, the middle Santa Ana River TMDL Task Force submitted a monitoring program for Regional Board consideration. The Regional Board approved the proposed monitoring program on June 29, 2007 (Resolution No. R8-2007-0046). The Taskforce continues to implement this approved bacterial indicator TMDL monitoring program. The Order requires the Dischargers to continue their participation in all activities related to the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Bacterial Indicator TMDL implementation.

2) **Agricultural/CAFO Discharges**

Pursuant to Task 5 of the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed Bacterial Indicator TMDLs, CAFO facilities were required to develop an Agricultural Source Evaluation Plan (AGSEP) for bacteria specific to CAFOs by November 30, 2007. These plans were to include steps needed to identify specific activities, operations, and processes that contribute bacterial indicators to Middle Santa Ana River Watershed waterbodies with a schedule for completion of each of the steps identified.

Irrigated agricultural operators and CAFO operators submitted the final AGSEP in March 2008. Regional Board approved the AGSEP in April 2008.
The Dischargers started implementing and monitoring of AGSEP in the winter of 2009 and the final AGSEP report was submitted in July 2009. Implementation of the plan included a wet weather monitoring program that was also completed in 2009.

The agricultural dischargers developed an Agricultural Bacteria Source Management Plan under Task 5.2. In October 2012, Regional Board staff completed the task of identifying non-CAFO agricultural operators. The CAFO facilities continue to cooperate in the TMDL Taskforce activities related to the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial Indicator TMDL including the watershed wide monitoring program since 2007.

The CAFO Dischargers in the middle Santa Ana River Watershed are required to submit interim reports that include an evaluation of the effectiveness of their bacteria source control measures and progress towards meeting the WLAs. This report is mandated by this Order but may be prepared and submitted in collaboration with the TMDL Taskforce.

2. Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake Watershed – Nutrient TMDLs

Pursuant to the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs (Resolution No. R8-2004-0037), the following WLAs apply to CAFO facilities in the San Jacinto River watershed that drain, directly and indirectly, to San Jacinto River, Salt Creek and/or Canyon Lake. The allocations apply to these CAFO facilities as a group.

a. **Total Phosphorous WLA**: Compliance needs to be achieved as soon as possible, but no later than December 31, 2020.

   132 kilograms/year (10-year running average)

b. **Total Nitrogen WLA**: Compliance needs to be achieved as soon as possible, but no later than December 31, 2020.

   1,908 kilograms/year (10-year running average)

c. **TMDL Monitoring Requirements**

1. **Nutrient TMDL Water Quality Monitoring Program**

Pursuant to Task 4 of the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs, (Resolution No. R8-2004-0037), CAFO facilities were required to develop and implement a watershed-wide, Canyon Lake in-lake and Lake Elsinore in-lake nutrient monitoring program to develop data necessary to review and update the Nutrient TMDLs. Data so developed could also be used for determination of compliance with the TMDLs and WLAs for nitrogen and phosphorus.

On behalf of specific dischargers named in the Nutrient TMDLs including dairy operators, the Lake Elsinore and San Jacinto Watershed Authority submitted a
monitoring program for Regional Board consideration. The Regional Board approved the proposed monitoring program on March 3, 2006 (Resolution No. R8-2006-0031) and was later modified in March 2011 (Resolution No. R8-2011-0023) and October 2012 (Resolution No. R8-2012-0052). This Order requires the dairy operators, in collaboration with other stakeholders, to continue to implement the updated Nutrient TMDL monitoring program.

2. Agricultural/CAFO Discharges – Nutrient Reduction Plan

Pursuant to Task 5 of the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs, CAFO facilities were required to develop Agricultural Nutrient Management Plan (AgNMP) specific to CAFOs by September 30, 2007. These plans were to include steps needed to identify nutrient sources and to develop nutrient reduction strategies, including time schedules for implementation.

A coalition of CAFO operators and farmers in the San Jacinto River Basin have formed the Western Riverside County Agricultural Coalition (WRCAC). WRCAC submitted a plan for development of Agricultural Nutrient Management Plan (AgNMP) for Regional Board consideration. The Regional Board approved the proposed plan in November 2007 in Resolution No. R8-2007-0083. A draft AgNMP was submitted in December 2011 for Regional Board comments. Regional Board provided comments in a letter dated May 16, 2012. Final AgNMP was due on July 21, 2012. Because the stakeholders conducted additional model analysis to identify appropriate nutrient control measures, an extension to the AgNMP was granted to WRCAC. In January 2013, the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permittees, in collaboration with other non-agricultural stakeholders, submitted a revised final Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan.

Non-point source agricultural dischargers are regulated under Order No. R8-2016-0003, Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from Agricultural Operations in the Watersheds of the San Jacinto River and its Tributaries, and Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore and their Tributaries, Collectively “The San Jacinto River Watershed”, Riverside County (CWAD), adopted on June 3, 2015. This Order continues the Regional Board’s efforts for agricultural dischargers to collectively develop solutions to control pollutants in the San Jacinto River watershed through vehicles such as the AgNMP. Dairy operators are not part of the non-point source agricultural dischargers. However, the TMDL provisions of this Order allow dairy operators to comply through cooperative monitoring and other actions coordinated with agricultural, municipal and other stakeholders.

3. Lake Elsinore In-Lake Sediment Nutrient Reduction Plan

Pursuant to Task 9 of the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs, CAFO facilities were required to develop a proposed plan and schedule for in-lake sediment nutrient reduction for Lake Elsinore by March 31, 2007. The proposed plan was to include an evaluation of the applicability of various in-lake treatment
4. Canyon Lake In-Lake Sediment Treatment Evaluation

Pursuant to Task 10 of the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs, CAFO facilities were required to develop a proposed plan for evaluating in-lake sediment nutrient treatment strategies for Canyon Lake by March 31, 2007. The proposed plan was to include an evaluation of the applicability of various in-lake treatment technologies to prevent the release of nutrients from lake sediments in order to develop a long-term strategy for control of nutrients from the sediment. The submittal was also to contain a proposed sediment nutrient monitoring program to evaluate the effectiveness of any strategies that are implemented.

This task has been completed through a Proposition 50 grant obtained by the San Jacinto River Watershed Council. The final report was submitted to the Regional Board on August 3, 2007. Draft Canyon Lake sediment reduction plan was submitted to the Regional Board in December 2011 (as part of Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan (CNRP)\(^\text{20}\) and AgNMP submittal). Regional Board provided comments on CNRP and AgNMP in March 2012 and May 2012, respectively. Final revised CNRP has been submitted in Jan 2013 and was approved by the Regional Board (Resolution No. R8-2013-0044).

5. Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore in-lake Model Updates

Pursuant to Task 11 of the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs, CAFO facilities were required to develop a proposal and schedule for updating the existing Lake Elsinore/San Jacinto River Nutrient Watershed Model and the Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore in-lake models by March 31, 2007. The plan and schedule was to consider additional data and information generated from the respective TMDL monitoring programs. In order to facilitate any needed update of the numeric targets and/or the TMDLs/WLAs, the proposed schedule was to take into consideration the Regional Board’s triennial review schedule.

This plan was approved by Regional Board in November 2007 (Resolution No. R8-2007-0083). A Model update was submitted in August 2011.

6. Other Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake TMDL Activities

---

\(^{20}\) The Riverside County stormwater co-permittees have submitted for Regional Water Board approval, a Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan (CNRP) that provides a plan and a schedule for how the co-permittees will achieve compliance with the Lake Elsinore/Canyon Lake Nutrient TMDLs and WLA. The AgNMP was developed in coordination with the CNRP.
The CAFO operators in the San Jacinto watershed are pursuing a number of other options. These include conducting pilot studies to determine the effectiveness of those control measures, including waste-to-energy projects. If the pilot projects prove successful, some of these projects could be implemented to address any adverse impacts from CAFO discharges to surface and groundwaters. Further, the CAFO operators, as part of the larger watershed-wide stakeholder group, are working with Regional Board staff on a revision to the TMDLs. Revisions to the TMDLs are likely to result in changes to the CAFOs’ TMDL Waste Load Allocations and TMDL compliance dates.

J. Plain Language

California Government Code Section 6219(a) states that “Each department, commission, office, or other administrative agency of state government shall write each document that it produces in plain, straightforward language, avoiding technical terms as much as possible, and using a coherent and easily readable style.” This requirement is more commonly known as the State’s “plain language requirement”. Order No. R8-2018-0001 and this Fact Sheet have been prepared with careful consideration of the plain language requirement.

There are a variety of indicators for measuring the ‘readability’ of a document. These indicators include the Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease, Flesch Kincaid Grade Level, and the Gunning Fog Score. These first two indicators are widely available in common word-processing software and were applied to the Order and Fact Sheet. The results indicate that a person that has achieved a college sophomore level of education should be able to readily understand these documents. Given the technical and legal subject matter, the readability of the Order and this Technical Report is appropriate and satisfies the State plain language requirement.

K. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations [Not Applicable]

VIII. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

Wastes from CAFOs contain high concentrations of salts (total dissolved solids and nitrates). These wastes originate from the excretion of manure in corrals and milk barns. Wash water that is discharged from the milk barn as a result of milk barn and cow cleaning operations contains approximately 10 percent of the daily manure excreted from a cow. Wash water is flushed from the milk barn, generally into on-site wastewater containment ponds. Also, rainfall runoff that contacts manure in the corrals carries manure from the corrals into the wastewater containment ponds.

Previous studies conducted by the Regional Board have shown that cow manure produced in the Region contains approximately 160 pounds of salt per (dry) ton of manure (110 pounds of salt per ton of manure @ 33% moisture)\(^2\). In addition, the Regional Board’s 1990 report, “Dairies and Their Relationship to Water Quality Impacts

---

in the Chino Basin", (1990 Dairy Report) showed that the use of manure as a fertilizer results in two to four times more salt reaching groundwater (up to 10 times more non-nitrate salts) than the use of non-manure commercial fertilizers. For this reason, it is vital to make sure that all applications of manure and process wastewater to land are regulated, so they will not adversely impact the quality of groundwater and surface water in the Region.

The 1990 Dairy Report mostly dealt with dairies in the Chino Basin area. However, the recommendations for the dairy regulatory program in that report are equally applicable to dairies in the San Jacinto watershed. Most elements of the dairy regulatory program recommendations in the Report have been implemented through the 1994 (Order No. 94-7), 1999 (Order No. 99-11), 2007 (Order No. R8-2007-0001), and 2013 (Order No. R8-2013-0001) general NPDES permits. The recommendations in the 1990 Dairy Report include the following:

1. Prohibit the discharge of dairy wastes to land unless an acceptable offset program is developed and implemented to offset the impacts of salt and nutrient discharges. (Offset programs have been developed and the CAFOs are participating in those programs.)
2. Control the discharge of dairy wastes to surface waters by requiring the CAFOs to properly design, construct, operate and maintain waste containment structures that are designed to contain a 25-year, 24-hour storm runoff along with process wastewater. (Staff developed requirements for the design of Engineered Waste Management Plans. All CAFOs in the region have developed and implemented Engineered Waste Management Plans. Staff also developed a Weekly Inspection Log that the CAFOs are required to complete and submit to the Regional Board with the annual report.)
3. Monitor the impact of dairy waste discharges on surface and groundwaters. (The CAFOs are participating in comprehensive monitoring programs to determine the impacts of their discharges on surface and groundwaters.)
4. Regulate land application at agronomic rates. (All CAFOs that apply dairy biomass to land have developed and implemented Nutrient Management Plans. Staff developed a tracking system to track manure application, Form 3.)
5. Track manure management. (Staff developed a Manure Tracking Manifest and an Annual Report Form to collect information about manure management and overall dairy operations.)
6. Encourage Innovative approaches to dairy waste management. (Regional Board staff has helped the dairy industry to obtain grants for research projects to better manage their waste products.)

The proposed Order requires the CAFOs to continue their participation in the salt and nutrient offset programs, in the monitoring programs, and to manage storm water and process wastewater in accordance with the requirements of their approved Engineered Waste Management Plans, and land application in accordance with the approved Nutrient Management Plans. In addition, there are requirements to comply with CAFO waste load allocations.

Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations

General Waste Discharge Requirements

Provisions II. A. 13 & 15 in the proposed Order prohibits the discharge of dairy biomass unless an offset program to offset the impacts of salt and nutrient discharges is implemented. In accordance with the requirements in the 2013 Permit, the Dischargers, in collaboration with other stakeholders in the area, have developed and implemented an offset program in the Chino Basin. They are in the process of developing an offset program in the San Jacinto River Basin.

Salt and nutrient management in dairy biomass (manure, litter, bedding, and process wastewater) continues to be a major challenge for dairy waste management. The Chino Basin Optimum Basin Management Program addresses salt and nutrient management programs in the Chino Basin, where 72% of the CAFOs are located. The offset programs in the Chino Basin have been implemented and appear to be working well.

In the San Jacinto Basin, Eastern Municipal Water District has two operating desalters and an additional one is proposed. Studies have been completed in the area to evaluate options for salt and nutrient management in the basin and to develop comprehensive management programs. The Dischargers in the San Jacinto area, in collaboration with the San Jacinto Resource Conservation District, developed a “Final Workplan to Offset the Impacts of Dairy Process Wastewater Discharge and Manure Land Application within the San Jacinto River Basin” (Final Workplan). The San Jacinto Watershed Integrated Regional Dairy Management Plan (San Jacinto Plan) was developed as a subset of this Final Workplan.

The Final Workplan and the San Jacinto Plan were developed to assist dairy operators in the San Jacinto watershed in their efforts to implement management practices necessary to help solve groundwater, surface water, air quality, TMDL and salt and nutrient offsets to meet regulatory requirements. These Plans recognize a number of control practices that each dairy facility should be able to implement in addition to participating in local groundwater improvement projects.

The USDA-ARS Salinity Laboratory23 conducted a pilot nutrient management project on a San Jacinto dairy (Transport and Fate of Nutrients and Indicator Microorganisms at a Dairy Lagoon Water Application Site by Scott Bradford, March 2011) to investigate the efficacy of implementing an NMP that included applying dairy wastewater to cropland. The study demonstrated that with carefully controlled water application and selection of appropriate crops, very little leaching of the salts occurred below the root zone. However, the salts remain stored in the vadose zone where infiltrating precipitation can eventually carry the salt into the groundwater. This process can take decades, depending on the soil chemistry, precipitation events, soil transmissivity, and depth to groundwater. In the Chino Basin, the process has been estimated to take between 10 and 50 years24.

Extensive computer modeling studies on TDS and nitrate have been conducted to determine acceptable salt loading rates to groundwater from various sources.

23 http://nepis.epa.gov/Adobe/PDF/P100DOTV.pdf
including CAFOs. These studies are the basis of the TDS and nitrogen management plan presented in the 1995 Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (Basin Plan) and its most recent amendment (Regional Board Resolution No. R8-2004-0001, hereinafter referred to as the Basin Plan Amendment).

The State Board approved the Basin Plan Amendment on September 30, 2004. The groundwater components of the amendment became effective upon approval by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on December 23, 2004. The USEPA approved the surface water standards and related provisions of the Amendment on June 20, 2007. The Basin Plan Amendment incorporates an updated TDS and Nitrogen Management Plan for the Santa Ana Region, which includes revised groundwater sub-basin boundaries (referred to as groundwater management zones), revised TDS and nitrate-nitrogen quality objectives for groundwater, revised TDS and nitrogen WLAs and changes to specific surface waters; including revised reach designations, revised TDS and nitrogen objectives and modifications to beneficial use designations.

The Eastern Municipal Water District developed a Salt Management Plan for the San Jacinto Watershed and requested the Regional Board to revise the groundwater objectives for the San Jacinto Upper Pressure Management Zone based on a maximum benefit analysis. On October 29, 2010 the Regional Board approved a Basin Plan amendment (Resolution No. R8-2010-0039) to accommodate this request. On April 23, 2012, the Office of Administrative Law approved this Basin Plan amendment.

As indicated above, the Regional Board is actively involved in managing the TDS and nitrogen issues in the region and the stakeholders are active participants in these efforts.

The previously adopted general waste discharge requirements (Orders No. 99-11 and R8-2013-0001) included three significant changes from the Regional Board’s prior CAFO regulatory program. First, they prohibited the disposal of corral manure anywhere in the Region and prohibited the use of corral manure as a fertilizer in any groundwater sub-basin lacking assimilative capacity for salts, including the Chino Basin, thereby prohibiting the application of any corral manure in the Chino Basin for any reason (previously disposal of manure was limited to 4.4 tons/acre on disposal land, and use of corral manure as a fertilizer on cropland was limited to 17.6 tons/acre).

Second, corral manure was required to be hauled from the facility within 180 days of being removed from the corrals, thereby preventing the long-term accumulation of manure stockpiles on-site (before, some facilities were increasingly stockpiling manure on-site rather than hauling it away). Third, CAFOs were required to develop and implement engineered waste management plans (prior to the adoption of these permits comprehensive waste management containment structure design, construction or operation plans for CAFOs did not exist).

As required under the 2007 permit (R8-2013-0001), the Dischargers have developed and implemented EWMPs that are generally consistent with federal and state
Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations

General Waste Discharge Requirements

By Order No. R8-2018-0001, all CAFO operators are required to demonstrate compliance with the waste discharge requirements at approximately 186,000 tons annually. This order requires that CAFO operators submit plans that address waste discharges (including those from CAFOs) in the Region, and also establish NMPs that address waste discharges from legacy sources.

B. Prado Basin Management Zone

Order No. R8-2013-0001 required the CAFO operators to demonstrate by September 2008 that CAFO discharges were addressed by the OBMP facilities and programs. Further, in case the CAFO operators that could not demonstrate that CAFO discharges are addressed by OBMP facilities and programs, they were to formulate and implement an acceptable offset or cease the discharge of wastes in the Prado Basin Management Zone within five years.

A. Chino Basin (Chino-North, Chino-East, and Chino-South Groundwater Management Zones)

Seventy three percent of the CAFOs in the Region are located in the Chino Basin. Based on data collected from the 2017 CAFO Annual Reports, approximately 186,000 tons of manure were removed from the corrals in the Chino Basin. Of this, at least 7,000 tons (4%) were hauled out of the Region and 179,000 tons (96%) were disbursed inside the Region. Of that applied within the Region, 115,000 tons were applied to cropland and 64,000 tons were sent to composting facilities.

The Chino Basin desalter program is a key feature of the salt management strategy that includes the Optimum Basin Management Plan (OBMP). It is integrated into the OBMP along with other groundwater management activities (enhanced recharge, plume management, monitoring, etc.) to assure water quality enhancement, yield management, hydraulic control, and the maximum beneficial use of the Chino Basin groundwater. Waste discharges (including those from CAFOs) in the Chino Basin have been addressed in this integrated plan. The desalter capacity and groundwater extraction well locations have been established to assure that the total salt removal from the Chino Basin is in sufficient quantity to mitigate all the salt added using recycled water, ongoing discharges (including those from CAFOs), and legacy sources. Currently, there are two desalters in operation in the Chino Basin (Chino I and Chino II).

Currently, there are no dairies in the Chino-South Groundwater Management Zone and the Chino-East Groundwater Management Zone. Since the operation of the hydraulic control wells has reversed the gradient of the Chino-South and Chino-East Groundwater Management Zones to drain towards the Chino-North Groundwater Management Zone, groundwater being intercepted by these wells, and thus hydraulic control is achieved. Since waste discharges from CAFOs within the Chino Basin have been addressed in the OBMP, this order does not restrict discharges to land from these facilities, as long as the Chino Basin Watermaster and IEUA are continuing their efforts of implementing the commitments to meet the maximum benefit water quality objectives in the Basin Plan Amendment.

B. Prado Basin Management Zone

Order No. R8-2013-0001 required the CAFO operators to demonstrate by September 2008 that CAFO discharges were addressed by the OBMP facilities and programs. Further, in case the CAFO operators that could not demonstrate that CAFO discharges are addressed by OBMP facilities and programs, they were to formulate and implement an acceptable offset or cease the discharge of wastes in the Prado Basin Management Zone within five years.

The OBMP facilities and programs, they were to formulate and implement a number of monitoring programs and other plans.
CAFO operators in the Prado Basin Management Zone determined that CAFO discharges were not covered under the OBMP facilities and programs. Consequently, they submitted a conceptual workplan to offset the impact of their discharges (March 2009) and the final Work Plan with a proposed time schedule (November 2009).

At the time of adoption of Order No. R8-2013-0001, only one dairy was in the Prado Basin Management Zone.

C. San Jacinto River Basin

Historically, manure has been used to supplement the use of commercial chemical fertilizer on agricultural fields in the San Jacinto River Basin. When the Regional Board prohibited the disposal of corral manure anywhere in the Region and prohibited the use of corral manure as a fertilizer in the Chino Basin, most of the manure produced in the Chino Basin was then hauled to the San Jacinto River Basin for use as fertilizer. Currently, it is estimated that there are about 59,000 acres of land under cultivation in the San Jacinto River Basin.25

Basin Plan Amendment (Resolution No. R8-2004-0001) indicates that all the groundwater management zones in the San Jacinto River Basin, except for the Canyon Groundwater Management Zone, lack assimilative capacity for additional salt inputs. In addition, all the groundwater management zones within the San Jacinto River Basin, except for the Canyon and Perris North Groundwater Management Zones, lack assimilative capacity for additional nitrate inputs.

Consequently, discharges of manure, wash water, and storm water to land must be prohibited unless Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) and nitrogen loadings from these discharges are adequately offset. Order No. R8-2007-0001, in part, prohibited the discharge of wastes containing TDS and/or nitrogen concentrations more than the underlying groundwater management zone objectives, unless the discharge of waste is adequately offset to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer.

The Regional Board recognized that it was not feasible for this waste discharge prohibition to be implemented immediately. Therefore, a time schedule for compliance was provided in Order No. R8-2007-0001 that required full compliance with the prohibition by September 6, 2012. Order No. R8-2007-0001 required that the CAFO operators submit a Work Plan to offset the impacts of discharge of process wastewater and land application of manure within the San Jacinto River Basin.

On behalf of CAFO operators and farmers, San Jacinto Basin Resource Conservation District (SJBRCD) submitted a conceptual Work Plan on January 2, 2008. The final Work Plan and proposed time schedule was submitted by SJBRCD for Regional Board consideration on September 18, 2008. The Regional Board

---

25 Staff Report for the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements, Order No. R8-2016-0003.
approved the final Work Plan and the proposed time schedule on October 29, 2008.

The final Work Plan and its supplement (the San Jacinto Watershed Integrated Regional Dairy Management Plan, IRDMP) provided several recommendations to control and/or offset the discharge of salts and nutrients to the San Jacinto River Basin. Appendix F of the IRDMP contains a report for “Salt Offset Options for the San Jacinto River Basin Dairies” (Salt Offset Options Report). Collectively, the Work Plan, the IRDMP, and the Salt Offset Options Report identify numerous options to address the salt and nutrient loadings into the San Jacinto Basin. While some of these options may not directly pertain to salt and nutrient offsets, they could be considered as elements of an overall Region-wide plan for water quality improvements. The following recommendations have been implemented:

1. Conducted a pilot study for a Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CNMP) at a San Jacinto dairy facility.
2. Conducted a demonstration project of a Vibratory Shear Enhanced Processing (VESP) system at a San Jacinto dairy facility.
3. Conducted a partial watershed monitoring program for run-off to Mystic Lake.
4. Conducted a Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore in-lake nutrient monitoring program.
5. Developed a Lake Elsinore in-lake nutrient reduction plan.
7. Developed a CAFO Ag-Nutrient Management Plan to identify nutrient sources and to develop nutrient reduction strategies.
8. Conducted a watershed-wide sampling program for dairy wastewater and manure.
9. Conducted a watershed-wide sampling and analysis program to determine dairy salt loads and to develop a dairy salt load report.
10. Developed and implemented a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) for specific dairy sites that land apply manure to cropland (9 dairy sites).
11. Developed an Integrated Regional Dairy Management Plan (IRDMP) addressing water quality issues related to dairy wastes including salts, nutrients, and pathogens.
12. Developed a Manure Manifest Tracking System for the San Jacinto Basin for local and imported manure.
13. Developed a manure composting program that could be considered on a regional scale or on a site-specific scale to stabilize raw manure for cropland application and/or export out of the San Jacinto Basin.
14. Developed a program to encourage manure export from the Basin.
15. Started negotiations with other stakeholders, such as Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), to reduce salts in dairy source water. Initiated a full-scale demonstration project for conversion of manure waste to diesel fuel at a San Jacinto dairy.

The Salt Offset Options Report states that manure applied to cropland as a fertilizer contributes more than 90% of each dairy’s salt and nutrient loads. A limited study at one of the San Jacinto CAFOs by the University of California Riverside, Salinity
Laboratory indicated that a properly managed and implemented Nutrient Management Plan can significantly limit salt to the root zone with little leaching to groundwater. Nine of the San Jacinto dairy facilities are now implementing Nutrient Management Plans for croplands. For manure applied to non-dairy related cropland, farmers in the San Jacinto Basin are required to implement an Agricultural Nutrient Management Plan. In addition, there is an increase in the manure export from some of the dairies to locations outside the region.

To monitor dairy salt and nitrate loading, a dairy sampling program for dairy wastewater and manure has been implemented. In conjunction with this sampling program, a watershed-wide sampling and analysis program for dairy salt loads has been implemented to develop a dairy salt load report.

The IRDMP is considered a working document for the San Jacinto CAFOs. There continues to be additional studies and pilot projects to demonstrate other feasible alternatives to address waste loads in addition to the sixteen control measures (listed above) that have been already implemented. With the implementation of these options and natural recharge, the Groundwater Management Zones have the potential to reduce the concentrations of salt and nutrients.

The Dischargers in the San Jacinto Basin have indicated that the above control measures have reduced the salt and nutrient loadings to the Basin and no further offsets might be needed. The proposed Order includes requirements for the Dischargers to collect and analyze groundwater monitoring data to confirm that discharges from the CAFO facilities have not impacted groundwater quality in the San Jacinto Basin. If these analyses indicate statistically significant impacts from the CAFO discharges, additional control measures must be developed and implemented.

The proposed Order requires the CAFO's in the area to continue to implement the control measures and evaluate their effectiveness in addressing salt and nutrient problems and to propose additional measures, if needed.

As previously noted, Canyon Lake and Lake Elsinore are on the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies due, in part, to the effects of excessive amounts of nutrients, including nitrogen and phosphorous. The TMDL adopted by the Regional Board and approved by USEPA requires the reduction of nutrients from all sources in the watershed, including CAFOs. The Nutrient TMDLs specify CAFO WLAs for both nitrogen and phosphorus. The Dischargers are working with the TMDL taskforces to help implement the TMDLs.

There are a number of other research projects and pilot studies, including a waste-to-energy project, that are being conducted or proposed. The requirements specified in the proposed Order are consistent with the state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to CAFOs. Based on the results of the pilot studies and the research work, these requirements may be revised.
D. Discharge Prohibitions

The Order includes the following prohibitions:

1. The discharge of wastes to land or to surface waters, including storm water conveyance systems, shall be in accordance with the provisions of this Order. All other discharges of wastes to land and surface waters are prohibited (40 C.F.R. § 412.37(a)).

2. The discharge of wastes to land or to surface waters shall not cause a condition of contamination, pollution or nuisance as defined in Water Code section 13050.

3. The discharge of wastes not generated by the dairy-related activities at the facility is prohibited except with written authorization from the Executive Officer.

4. The disposal of any mortality (dead animals) in any process wastewater system, liquid manure or other facilities within the regulated CAFO is prohibited (40 C.F.R. § 412.37(a)(4)). Mortalities shall be handled in such a way as to prevent the discharge of pollutants to waters of the State. All dead animals shall be disposed of within three days. Records of mortality management shall be kept for five years (40 C.F.R. §§ 122.42(e)(1)(ii) and 412.37(b)(4)).

5. The discharge of process wastewater to a land application area before, during or after a storm event that would result in runoff of the applied water is prohibited.

6. The discharge of wastewater to surface waters from the cropland is prohibited. Irrigation supply water that comes into contact or is blended with waste or process wastewater shall be considered wastewater under this prohibition.

7. The discharge of storm water to surface waters from a land application area where manure or process wastewater has been applied is prohibited unless the land application area has been managed consistent with an approved Nutrient Management Plan.

8. The use of manure to construct containment structures is prohibited.

9. The discharge of wastes, including manure, process wastewater and/or storm water runoff from manured areas, to property not owned or controlled by the Discharger, except as authorized by this Order, is prohibited (40 C.F.R. § 412.31(a)).

10. There shall be no discharge of chemicals, or other wastes that are not associated with the CAFO operations to the waste management facilities and/or the waste handling facilities (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(e)(1)(v)).

11. Temporary waste storage areas shall be designed and constructed in a manner to prevent runoff and leachate from entering surface or groundwater.
12. Waste storage or disposal facilities shall not be built within 400 feet of a public drinking water well.

13. All confined animals shall be prohibited from entering or directly contacting any surface water (Title 27 CCR Section 22561, 40 C.F.R. § 122.42(e)(iv)).

14. The disposal of manure to land within Chino Basin (Chino-North, Chino-East, and Chino-South Groundwater Management Zones) is prohibited. The application of manure, process wastewater, and/or storm water runoff from manured areas, on cropland outside of the Chino Basin that overlie groundwater management zones lacking assimilative capacity for TDS and/or nitrate-nitrogen is also prohibited unless a plan, acceptable to the Executive Officer, is implemented that offsets the effects of such application on the underlying groundwater management zone.

15. Manure applied to non-CAFO related croplands in any area that may affect a groundwater management zone that has TDS and nitrate-nitrogen assimilative capacity shall not exceed agronomic rates. In addition, the manure shall be incorporated into the soil immediately after application. For any application of manure to these croplands in excess of 12 dry tons per acre per year (or 17.5 tons per acre per year @ 33% moisture), an explanation of the type of crop and the number of times it is harvested per year shall also be included in the Annual Report (Form 3).

16. Manure originating from outside of the Chino Basin is prohibited from being applied to land within the Chino Basin.

17. The discharge of any substances in concentrations toxic to animal or plant life is prohibited.

18. The discharge of waste containing TDS and/or Nitrogen concentrations in excess of the underlying groundwater management zone objectives for those constituents is prohibited, unless adequately offset to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer.

E. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations (TBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

CWA Section 301(b) and federal regulations 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 require that TBELs be established based on several levels of controls:

   a. Best practicable treatment control technology (BPT) represents the average of the best performance by plants within an industrial category or subcategory. BPT standards apply to toxic, conventional, and non-conventional pollutants.

   b. Best available technology economically achievable (BAT) represents the best existing performance of treatment technologies that are economically
achievable within an industrial point source category. BAT standards apply to toxic and non-conventional pollutants.

c. Best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) represents the control from existing industrial point sources of conventional pollutants including BOD, TSS, fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease. The BCT standard is established after considering the “cost reasonableness” of the relationship between the cost of attaining a reduction in effluent discharge and the benefits that would result, and the cost-effectiveness of additional industrial treatment beyond BPT.

d. New source performance standards (NSPS) represent the best available demonstrated control technology standards. The intent of NSPS guidelines is to set limitations that represent state-of-the-art treatment technology for new sources.

The CWA requires USEPA to develop Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards (ELGs) representing application of BPT, BAT, BCT, and NSPS. Section 402(a)(1) of the CWA and 40 C.F.R. § 125.3 of the NPDES regulations authorize the use of Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) to derive technology-based effluent limitations on a case-by-case basis where ELGs are not available for certain industrial categories and/or pollutants of concern. Where BPJ is used, the permit writer must consider specific factors outlined in 40 C.F.R. § 125.3.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

The Order requires the Discharger to meet technology-based effluent limitations as per 40 C.F.R. § 412.31. The effluent limitations guidelines do not require numeric effluent limits. In order for treatment controls to reliably meet numeric effluent limits, both the quality and quantity of the effluent should have limited variability. However, the quality and quantity of storm water runoff from dairy facilities vary considerably. The Regional Board has determined that it is not feasible to establish numeric effluent limitations for pollutants in discharges from CAFOs at this time because of this variability. This Order requires the Discharger to develop and implement best management practices (BMPs), including the development and implementation of EWMPs to contain waste and storm water up to and including runoff from the 24-hour, 25-year storm event, consistent with the federal regulations. These and requirements for Nutrient Management Plans and other measures are expected to control and abate the discharge of pollutants to surface waters and achieve compliance utilizing BPT to achieve applicable water quality standards.

Whenever precipitation causes an overflow of manure, litter, or process wastewater, pollutants in the overflow may be discharged from the facility, provided all provisions of an Engineered Waste Management Plan (EWMP), accepted by the Executive Officer, are fully implemented, and:
a. The production area\textsuperscript{26} is designed, constructed, operated and maintained to contain all manure, litter, and process wastewater including the runoff and the direct precipitation from a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event; and (40 C.F.R. § 412.31(a)(1)(i))

b. The operations at the facility are conducted in accordance with the additional measures required by 40 C.F.R. § 412.37(a) and (b) with respect to inspection, corrective actions, monitoring and record keeping as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Requirements of this Order (Attachment B) (40 C.F.R. § 412.31(a)(1)(ii)).

F. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

As specified in 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include WQBELs for pollutants (including toxicity) that are or may be discharged at levels that cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard. The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria contained in state plans and policies, and meet water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

2. Applicable Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

   a. Participation in the TMDL taskforces including the monitoring programs, workplan development and implementation activities either by each individual Discharger or by all the Dischargers represented by a trade association shall be considered in assessing compliance with the waste load allocations in the TMDLs.

   b. All Dischargers within the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake watershed shall comply with the Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake Watershed Nutrient TMDL requirements specified in Section IV.J. of the Order.

   c. All Dischargers within the Santa Ana watershed shall comply with the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial TMDL requirements including the time schedules, Section IV.H. of the Order.

3. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

The designated beneficial uses of the receiving waters are listed in Sections I.L. 31 and 32. The requirements specified in this Order are necessary to protect water quality standards in the receiving waters.

4. Determining the Need for WQBELs

\textsuperscript{26}See Glossary for a definition of “production area”.
NPDES permits apply to discharges of waste to surface waters. These permits must meet all applicable provisions of sections 301 and 402 of the Clean Water Act. These provisions require controls of pollutant discharges that utilize Best Available Technology and Best Conventional Technology to reduce pollutant and any more stringent controls necessary to meet water quality standards.

Since portions of this order will serve as an NPDES permit and will allow discharges to surface waters that are impaired, albeit only during extreme weather conditions, federal regulations require the order to include WQBELs for those discharges.

The permit requirements are protective of water quality. The only discharges to surface waterbodies, or tributaries thereof, that are permitted are those from rainfall events that cause an overflow from facilities designed, constructed and operated to contain all process wastewater plus the runoff and the direct precipitation (that have been commingled with manure) from a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event. The water quality standards allow for infrequent excursions consistent with the expected frequency of discharges from dairy facilities. Due to the catastrophic nature of such events and the significant volume of runoff involved, treatment of these discharges to meet numeric effluent limitations would be impractical. If the requirements specified in the order are met, water quality of the Region is not expected to degrade as a result of discharges authorized under this Order.

Therefore, the effluent limitations contained in this Order are narrative and include compliance with TMDL implementation plans. 40 C.F.R. §122.44(k)(3) allows the use of BMPs to control and abate the discharge of pollutants when "numeric effluent limitations are infeasible; or the practices are reasonably necessary to achieve effluent limitations and standards or to carry out the purposes and intent of the CWA."

Regional Board has adopted TMDLs that address pollutants of concern in the two watersheds where the CAFOs are located: Middle Santa Ana (bacterial indicators) and Lake Elsinore and Canyon Lake (nutrients). These TMDLs include WLAs for CAFOs. Pursuant to the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial indicator TMDLs CAFO compliance with the Dry Season WLA is to be achieved no later than December 2015.

Compliance with the Middle Santa Ana River Bacterial indicator TMDLs Wet Season WLA is to be achieved by December 2025. Since this Order will expire in December 15, 2023, final effluent limits, based on those allocations that are to be achieved beyond this permit term are not included in this Order. However, control measures are to be implemented for all TMDLs. See Section IV.D. of this Fact Sheet for a more detailed discussion of these TMDLs.

The TMDLs require water quality monitoring to be performed and pollution reduction plans to be developed by specified dates. The TMDL tasks applicable to CAFOs have been incorporated into this Order. CAFO operators can choose
to complete the tasks individually, or they may participate with the stakeholder group (TMDL Taskforces) to achieve compliance with the TMDLs.

5.  WQBEL Calculations [Not Applicable]

6.  Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) [Not Applicable]

G.  Final Effluent Limitations [Not Applicable]

H.  Interim Effluent Limitations [Not Applicable]

I.  Land Discharge Specifications

The discharge of waste containing TDS and/or Nitrogen concentrations in excess of the underlying groundwater management zone objectives for those constituents is prohibited, unless adequately offset to the satisfaction of the Executive Officer. Basin Plan Amendment, R8-2004-0001.

J.  Reclamation Specifications [Not Applicable]

IX.  RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A.  Surface Water

The Order includes receiving water limitation for surface waters based on Basin Plan prohibitions and/or objectives.

B.  Groundwater

The Order includes prohibitions on discharge of wastes from CAFOs that could adversely impact groundwater based on Basin Plan prohibitions and/or objectives.

X.  RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

40 C.F.R. § 122.48 requires all NPDES permits specify recording and reporting monitoring results. Sections 13267 and 13383 of the Water Code authorize the Regional Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment B), establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and state requirements.

A.  Influent Monitoring [Not Applicable]

B.  Effluent Monitoring

To assure compliance with Permit limitations and requirements, the Dischargers are required to sample and analyze any discharge of wastes to surface waters for total
dissolved solids (filterable residue), total coliform bacteria, E. coli, total nitrogen, total phosphorus and total suspended solids (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(i)).

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements [Not Applicable]

Whole effluent monitoring is not required in this Order because there is no indication that discharges contain toxicants that threaten water quality.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring [Not Applicable]

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

This Order requires monitoring to determine compliance with the WLAs in the TMDLs. The nutrient content of manure can vary significantly between dairies due to variations in animal diet and manure handling and storage procedures. Consequently, this Order also requires chemical analysis for manure. The purpose of this chemical analysis is to assist agricultural operators to apply manure to cropland at rates that closely meet the nutrient needs of the specific crop. Monitoring of manure nutrient content is also indicated in 40 C.F.R. § 412.4(c)(3).

XI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which in accordance with 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41 and 122.42, apply to all NPDES discharges and must be included in every NPDES permit, are provided in Attachment A.

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

This provision is based on 40 C.F.R. Part 123. The Regional Board may reopen the permit to modify permit conditions and requirements. Causes for modifications include the promulgation of new regulations, or adoption of new regulations by the State Board or Regional Board, including revisions to the Basin Plan.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

This Order includes a requirement for the Dischargers to participate in special studies that may be required to determine compliance with the WLAs in the TMDLs.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

---

In compliance with the CWA and the California Code of Regulations, this Order prohibits discharges to any surface water bodies, or tributary thereof, unless rainfall events cause an overflow of process wastewater from a facility designed, constructed and operated to contain all process wastewater plus the runoff and the direct precipitation (that have been commingled with manure) from a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event (Title 27, Chapter 7, Subchapter 2, Article 1, Section 22562(a), California Code of Regulations and 40 C.F.R. Part 412). To insure that compliance with these requirements is achieved, all CAFOs are required to develop and implement EWMPs. EWMPs are to be developed in accordance with the Guidelines for the Development of EWMP for CAFOs (Dairies and Related Facilities). It is intended that the guidelines can be revised, as necessary, by the Executive Officer. This Order authorizes the Executive Officer to make necessary revisions to the guidelines.

In March 1999, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the USEPA finalized their unified national strategy for AFOs. In general, the national strategy recommended the development of nutrient management plans (NMPs) that were intended to bring each CAFO into compliance with the requirements of the CWA and to minimize the impacts to groundwater and surface water from dairy wastes by the implementation of best management practices. In general, a NMP would assure that appropriate dairy wastewater facilities were developed, constructed and maintained to comply with the requirements of the CWA, and that the use and application of wastewater and manure (i.e. nutrient management) was managed to minimize impacts to groundwater and surface water. The most recent revisions to the NPDES and Effluent Limitation Guidelines and Standards for CAFO regulations, published on February 12, 2003, support this national strategy by requiring the CAFOs to develop and implement NMPs.

Consistent with the federal regulations, this Order requires CAFO operators who apply manure, litter, or process wastewater to croplands under their ownership or operational control to develop and fully implement a NMP in addition to the EWMPs. The NMP shall be prepared in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 122.42(e)(1) and 40 C.F.R. § 412.4, and should follow the guidelines developed by Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Conservation Practices Standard 590. The Discharger shall also comply with the recordkeeping requirements as described in 40 C.F.R. § 412.37(c). The NMP will be made available for public review for 30 days prior to its approval. If there is no objection after the reviewing period, the Executive Officer will approve the NMP and authorize the Discharger to start implementing the approved NMP within 90 days.

All Dischargers in the Region have complied with the requirements for developing and implementing EWMPs and NMPs.

4. Compliance Schedules

See Section VII.C.4 of the Order for a more detailed discussion of the compliance schedules.
5. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

The Dischargers are required to use qualified professionals for the development and implementation of EWMPs and NMPs.

6. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only) [Not Applicable]

7. Other Special Provisions [Not Applicable]

XII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (Regional Board) is considering the renewal of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for CAFOs. A draft of the General NPDES permit with all supporting documentation has been prepared and is available for public review and comments at:


A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Regional Board has notified the Dischargers and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through: posting of the Notice of Public Hearing at the Regional Water Board website: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana

B. Written Comments

The staff determinations are tentative. Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning this draft Permit. Comments should be submitted either in person or by mail to: Jawed Shami, Regional Water Quality Control Board, 3737 Main Street, Suite 500, Riverside, CA 92501. Comments can also be submitted by email at Adam.Fischer@waterboards.ca.gov.
C. Public Workshop/Hearing

Status report on the development of a new dairy permit was discussed at the following Regional Board meeting:

- **Date:** November 3, 2017
- **Time:** 9:00am
- **Location:** City Council Chambers of Loma Linda
  25541 Barton Road
  Loma Linda, CA 92354

First public workshop was held at the following location:

- **Date:** April 17, 2018
- **Time:** 9:00am
- **Location:** City of Norco – City Hall
  2870 Clark Avenue
  Norco, CA

Second public workshop was held at the following location:

- **Date:** April 19, 2018
- **Time:** 9:00am
- **Location:** Eastern Municipal Water District
  2270 Trumble Road
  Perris, CA

A third public workshop was held following the public release of a draft Order on July XX, 2018. The workshop was held at the following location:

- **Date:** August X, 2018
- **Time:** 9:00am
- **Location:** TBD

All comments received during the public workshops and the comment period will be considered in the formulation of the final draft that would be presented to the Board for its consideration.

The Regional Board will hold a public hearing for consideration of the final draft Permit during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location (to be determined):

- **Date:** September 07, 2018
- **Time:** 9:00 a.m.
- **Location:** City Council Chambers
  City of Loma Linda
  25541 Barton Road
Loma Linda, CA 92354

Interested persons are invited to attend the public workshop and the hearing. At the public workshop and the hearing, the Regional Board will hear testimony, if any, pertinent to the discharge, the draft Permit and related documents. Oral testimony will be heard; however, for accuracy of the record, important testimony should be in writing.

Additional workshops and/or public hearing may also be scheduled if the Regional Board, stakeholders or Regional Board staff determines a need for them. Please refer to the following website for most recent information regarding public workshops and public hearing. You may also contact Jawed Shami at 951-782-3288 (Jawed.Shami@waterboards.ca.gov).

Please be aware that dates and venues may also change. Our Web address is http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana where you can access notices of public workshops and hearing and the board meeting agenda, including any changes in dates and locations.

D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Resources Control Board to review the decision of the Regional Board regarding the adopted permit. The petition must be submitted within 30 days of the Regional Board’s action to the following address:

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

E. Information and Copying

All documents related to this Order, any comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at the address above any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Regional Board by calling (951) 782-4130.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the NPDES permit should contact the Regional Board, reference this Permit, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this Order should be directed to Jawed Shami at (951) 782-3288 (Jawed.Shami@waterboards.ca.gov).
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB, Assembly Bill
AFO, Animal Feeding Operations
AgNMP, Agricultural Nutrient Management Plan
AGSEP, Agricultural Source Evaluation Plan
APU, Administrative Procedures Manual
ARS, Agricultural Research Services
BAT, Best Available Technology
BCT, Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology
BMP, Best Management Practices
BOD, Biological Oxygen Demand
BPJ, Best Professional Judgment
BPT, Best Practicable Control Technology
CAFO, Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations
CCR, California Code of Regulations
CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act
CFR, Code of Federal Regulations
CIWQS, California Integrated Water Quality System
CNRP, Comprehensive Nutrient Reduction Plan
CTR, California Toxics Rule
CWA, Federal Clean Water Act
CWC, California Water Code
ELG, Effluent Limitations, Guidelines and Standards
EWMP, Engineered Waste Management Plan
GPS, Global Positioning System
IEUA, Inland Empire Utilities Agency
IRDMP, Integrated Regional Dairy Management Plan
MRP, Monitoring and Reporting Program
N/TDS, Nitrogen/Total Dissolved Solids
NMP, Nutrient Management Plan
NOI, Notice of Intent
NOT, Notice of Termination
NOTICE OF TERMINATION

TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE GENERAL PERMIT TO DISCHARGE WASTES FROM CONCENTRATED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS (DAIRIES AND RELATED FACILITIES)
(Order No. R8-2018-0001, NPDES No. CAG018001)

PERMITTEE (Person/Agency Responsible for the Discharge)

Owner/Operator Name: ____________________________________________________________________
Mailing Address: _______________________________________________________________________
Contact Person: _______________________________________________________________________

FACILITY (Physical Address)

Name: ________________________________________________________________________________
Location: ____________________________________________________________________________
Contact Person: _______________________________________________________________________

BASIS FOR TERMINATION

1. Facility Closed: The facility is closed and all CAFO (Dairies and Related Facilities) activities terminated.
   Date of closure __________/____/____

2. Facility Cleaning:
   Have all ponds/wastewater holding lagoons been drained, scraped, and solids removed? Yes____No____
   Has all manure been removed from Corrals (please provide manure tracking manifests)? Yes____No____
   Has all stockpiled manure been removed (please provide manure tracking manifests)? Yes____No____

3. New Facility Operator. Is there a new operator at this facility? Yes____No____
   Date facility was transferred to new operator __________/____/____
   Have you notified the new operator, in writing, of the NPDES Permit requirements? Yes____No____
   (If so, please provide a copy of notification)
   Have you provided a copy of EWMP and NMP (if applicable) to the new operator? Yes____No____
   Please provide new operator’s Name, Address, and Phone number _____________________________

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. I believe that the information submitted is true, accurate and complete. I am also aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment. I also understand that the submittal of this Notice of Termination does not release the facility operator from liability for any violations of Order No. R8-2018-0001.

Signature of Owner of Facility ____________________________ Signature of Operator of Facility ____________________________
Print or Type Name ____________________________ Print or Type Name ____________________________
Title and Date ____________________________ Title and Date ____________________________
Good Afternoon,

Please see the attached comments on the proposed Dairy Permit.

In addition, to our comments here are our notes:

2.1 - Finding 16 has an issue with the first sentence.

2.2 - Delete (a) from Findings K, paragraph 26, cite to 40 C.F.R. 122.44(a) the last portion of the sentence addresses sub (d).

2.3 - Revise finding L, paragraph 27. The sentence cites to 40 C.F.R. 122.44(k)(3) and (4).

Regards,

Colin A. Kelly
Senior Staff Attorney
Orange County Coastkeeper
Inland Empire Waterkeeper

PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law as attorney client and work-product confidential or otherwise confidential communications. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication or other use of a transmission received in error is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, immediately notify us at (714) 850-1965.
August 30, 2018

Sent Via Electronic Mail: santaana@waterboards.ca.gov

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Attn: Jawed Shami  
3737 Main Street, Suite 500  
Riverside, California 92501

Re: Comments on General Waste Discharge Requirements for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (Dairy and Related Facilities) Within the Santa Ana Region, Order R8-2018-0001, NPDES No. CAG18001

Dear Mr. Shami:

On behalf of Inland Empire Waterkeeper ("Waterkeeper"), please accept the following comment letter on the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (Dairy and Related Facilities) Within the Santa Ana Region ("Dairy Permit"). Waterkeeper is a local non-profit organization whose mission is to protect and enhance the water quality of the Upper Santa Ana River watershed through programs of advocacy, education, research, restoration, and enforcement. We have over two thousand members who live and/or recreate in and around the Santa Ana River watershed.

Waterkeeper urges the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region ("Regional Board") to amend critically important portions of the Dairy Permit to better reflect current federal requirements and promote transparency. Consistent with our comments made in our comment letter dated December 18, 2017, in collaboration with the Environmental and Natural Resources Law Clinic at Vermont Law School, Waterkeeper recommends that the Regional Board revise the draft Dairy Permit to (1) require electronic reporting; and (2) increase visual monitoring.

We further recommend that the Regional Board consider the general recommendations made in our aforementioned comment letter regarding dairy permits adopted elsewhere in California. For example, the San Francisco Regional Board’s dairy permit requires dairies to monitor groundwater for nitrates and coliform bacteria, while surface waters are sampled for specific conductance, total ammonium nitrogen, unionized ammonia, pH and temperature. This additional data provides the Regional Board, and the public, with additional information in which to determine a dairy’s impact on local surface and groundwater. Reflecting on decisions made by Regional Boards elsewhere might improve the quality of our own permit and create a
more consistent regulatory framework for industry, in addition to providing the opportunity to build on innovative water quality developments.

I. THE REGIONAL BOARD MUST REQUIRE ELECTRONIC REPORTING DURING THIS DAIRY PERMIT’S TERM

The Dairy Permit’s General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements/Self-Monitoring Reports section mandates that permittees submit hard copies of reports and notices to the Regional Board. Dairy Permit, Attachment B, Sec. X.A.2. Under that section, the permittee is required to submit “hard copy” reports and notices to the Regional Board until the State Water Resources Control Board or the Regional Board notifies the permittee to electronically file reports or notices required under the Dairy Permit. Id.

This requirement runs contrary to general conditions required to be included in all NPDES permits, and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (“CAFO”)-specific NPDES permits. 40 C.F.R. 122.41(l). All NPDES permits must require electronic filing of monitoring reports as of December 21, 2016. 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i). Bypass, non-compliance, and twenty-four hour reports must be electronically submitted starting December 21, 2020. 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.41(l)(4), 122.41(l)(6)(i), 122.41(l)(7), 122.41(m)(3). NPDES permits for CAFOs, such as the Dairy Permit, must require electronic submission of the minimum set of NPDES data for these permits by December 21, 2020. 40 C.F.R. §§ 127.11(a), 127.16(a). In this context, that minimum set is found in an Annual Program Report and includes a detailed description of the CAFO, including the type and number of animals; the amount of manure, litter and process wastewater; the total number of acres for land application covered by a nutrient management plan; the type and yield of crops; and other information. 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.11(a)(3), 122.42(e)(4). The federal requirement for electronic reporting is a known condition of all NPDES permits, including CAFO-specific NPDES permits. Such conditions are required to either be incorporated into an NPDES permit either expressly or by reference. 40 C.F.R. § 122.41.

The Regional Board must amend the Dairy Permit to require electronic reporting pursuant to the deadline found in federal law, if not sooner. California already maintains an electronic database that could be modified to allow electronic reporting for regional CAFO permittees. Efforts by the Regional Board were successful in modifying that database to allow for regional scrap metal permittees to electronically report. The Regional Board could, and should, require electronic reporting to begin as early as July 1, 2019, or at late as July 1, 2020. At minimum, the Dairy Permit should be revised to acknowledge the approaching federal electronic deadline and place permittee on notice of the significant change.
II. THE REGIONAL BOARD MUST REVISE THE VISUAL MONITORING REPORT TO REFLECT FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

The Dairy Permit must be revised to include daily inspections of CAFO facilities, in addition to the weekly visual updates included by the Regional Board. Each CAFO must implement visual inspections of the CAFO production area that, at a minimum, include:

(i) weekly inspections of all storm water diversion devices, runoff diversion structures, and devices channeling contaminated storm water to the wastewater and manure storage and containment structure;

(ii) daily inspection of water lines, including drinking water or cooling water lines;

(iii) weekly inspections of the manure, litter, and process wastewater impoundments; the inspection will note the level in liquid impoundments as indicated by the depth marker in paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

40 C.F.R. § 412.37(a)(1)(i-iii). The Regional Board attempts to incorporate this update by reference in citing the general code section in the Effluent Limitation section of the Dairy Permit. Dairy Permit, Sec. II.B.1.d. That reference seeks to capture each of the three required visual inspection requirements and further references Attachment B of the Dairy Permit.

Attachment B does include a visual inspection checklist, entitled: “Form 1: CAFO Weekly Storm Water Management Structure Inspections Log Sheet,” which appears to be the Regional Board’s form to comply with these minimum visual inspection requirements. As the checklist’s name confirms, Form 1 does not comply with the daily water line inspection minimum requirement and must be revised to be consistent with 40 C.F.R. § 412.37(a)(1)(ii).

Additionally, Form 1’s instructions are too narrow to capture the scope of BMPs described in subsections listed above. Form 1 limits visual inspections to “weekly inspections of your process wastewater and storm water containment structures.” Federal regulations are much broader, and require visual inspections of “all storm water diversion devices, runoff diversion structures, and devices channeling contaminated storm water,” as well as “manure, litter, and process wastewater impoundments.” 40 C.F.R. § 412.37(a)(1)(i), (iii). These requirements are much broader and include an array of BMPs present at CAFOs, but not required to be regularly inspected according to the form provided by the Regional Board. This must be revised to conform to the requirements of federal law.

III. REVISE NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN TO CORRECT OMISSION

Nutrient management plans are particularly important to protect water quality as they constitute effluent limitations under the Clean Water Act as they affect the rates of discharge from a point source to navigable waters. Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter v. Department of Environmental Quality, 747 N.W.2d 321 (2008), appeal denied 766 N.W.2d 857. Effluent limits for discharges from land application areas require that the permittee: (1) develop and implement the BMPs laid out in 40
C.F.R. § 412.4 [nutrient management plan]; (2) maintain records specified in 40 C.F.R. § 412.37 [recordkeeping for land application areas]; and (3) the CAFO shall attain the limitations and requirements by February 27, 2009. 40 C.F.R. § 412.31(b). The clarity of the nutrient management plan requirements must be acknowledged and reflected in the terms of the Dairy Permit because of the enforceable nature of those plans.

The Dairy Permit’s discussion of nutrient management plan requirements omits the need for the permittee to inspect land application equipment for leaks. Dairy Permit, Sec. IV.D. A CAFO operator must periodically inspect equipment used for land application of manure, litter, or process wastewater for leaks. 40 C.F.R. § 412.4(c)(4). That requirement should be in the body of the permit, inclusion in the Dairy Permit’s attached Fact Sheets is insufficient for notice, clarity, and enforcement. Details are critically important in nutrient management plans, which is why the Regional Board must revise that section of the Dairy Permit to correct the omission.

In conclusion, Waterkeeper appreciates the opportunity to engage the Regional Board in a discussion of the Dairy Permit. We look forward to receive your written response to our comments and look forward to the adoption hearing. Please contact me directly at colin@coastkeeper.org or at 714-850-1965 to discuss any questions or comments in response to this letter.

Sincerely,

Colin Kelly
Senior Staff Attorney
Inland Empire Waterkeeper
December 11, 2017

Sent via Email to Cindy.Li@waterboards.ca.gov

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
ATTN: Cindy Li
3737 Main Street, Suite 500
Riverside, CA 92501-3348

RE: Inland Empire Waterkeeper Comments on Permit Renewal- General Waste Discharge Requirements for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (Dairies and Related Facilities) Within the Santa Ana Region, Order R8-2013-0001

Dear Ms. Li:

Inland Empire Waterkeeper (“Waterkeeper”) protects the waters in the Santa Ana River Watershed for people and the environment. Santa Ana’s dairy industry, if well-regulated, can help protect our waters. Without a strong dairy CAFO permit, pollution from dairies threatens our waters. Waterkeeper strongly urges the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board to draft a strong dairy CAFO permit to protect our watershed.

The updated dairy CAFO permit must require dairies to electronically submit reports and data. The permit should also: 1) require dairies to monitor ground and surface water, 2) monitor specific harmful unregulated pollutants, 3) regularly update nutrient management plans and engineered waste management plans, 4) prepare and implement emergency plans, 5) visually monitor more frequently, and 6) call the Regional Board when there are unanticipated discharges. The permit should also incorporate changes to increase its transparency.

These recommendations stem from a comprehensive review of California dairy CAFO permits and permits from other top dairy-producing states. Following are our principle comments to improve the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (Dairies and Related Facilities) Within the Santa Ana Region (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) General Permit No. CAG018001, Regional Water Quality Control Board – Santa Ana Region Order No. R8-2013-0001) (hereinafter “Dairy Permit” or “Permit”). Waterkeeper thanks the board in advance for its time and for considering our substantive comments.
I. The New Dairy Permit Must Require Dairies to Electronically Submit Monitoring Reports, Bypass Events, and Annual Reports.


The new Dairy Permit should require dairies to submit all reports electronically, including non-compliance reports and twenty-four hour reports. Dairies should submit these reports to a searchable and publicly accessible database. This will improve data accuracy and compliance, promote transparency, and better protect the watershed. Electronic Reporting Rule at 64064.

II. The New Dairy Permit Should Require Ground and Surface Water Monitoring to Ensure Overall Compliance With and Effectiveness of the Permit.

The Dairy Permit does not require dairies to monitor ground or surface water. The new Dairy Permit should require dairies to monitor ground water for nitrates and coliform bacteria while monitoring surface water for specific conductance, total ammonium nitrogen, unionized ammonia, pH, and temperature. This provides the Regional Board and the public with a more complete picture of each dairy’s impact on local waters and groundwater. This data can help the Regional Board identify and address problem dairies. Other regions, like San Francisco Bay, require dairies to monitor ground and surface water.

III. The New Dairy Permit Should Require Monitoring of Harmful, Unregulated Pollutants To Protect Human Health.

Antimicrobials and hormones can pose significant risks to public health and the environment. See USEPA-Office of Water, Literature Review of Contaminants in Livestock and Poultry Manure and Implications for Water Quality, EPA 820-R-13-002, July 2013 at 49-56 (“Literature Review”). Dairies frequently use these chemicals in their operations, but they are currently unregulated. Id. at 29-31, 39-40. So the Regional Board and the public can understand if these pollutants are entering local waters from dairy operations, the New Dairy Permit should require dairies to test for antimicrobials and hormones.

Approximately 60 to 80% of all livestock raised in the United States routinely receive antimicrobials. Id. at 27. In 2010, livestock received 29 million pounds of antimicrobials, and that number continues to grow. Id. at 27, 49. When excreted, these chemicals enter ground and surface waters where they endanger aquatic life and human health. Id. at 27. This promotes the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance, which makes antimicrobials ineffective for human use. Id. at 49-56.
Hormones are endocrine disruptors that are artificially administered to or naturally produced by livestock. Id. at 39. In 2000, livestock excreted over 700,000 pounds of estrogens, androgens, and progestogens. Id. at 41. When they enter ground and surface waters, hormones affect the reproductive biology, physiology, and fitness of fish and other aquatic organisms. Id. at 39-40.

The California State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) established two Science Advisory Panels to assess the potential risks associated with harmful, unregulated pollutants like antimicrobials and hormones in recycled water and aquatic ecosystems. See Science Advisory Panel, Executive Summary to Monitoring Strategies for Chemicals of Emerging Concern (CECs) in Recycled Water: Recommendations of a Science Advisory Panel Final Report ii (June 2010); Science Advisory Panel, Preface to Monitoring Strategies for Chemicals of Emerging Concern (CECs) in California’s Aquatic Ecosystems Final Report i (April 2012) (hereinafter “CECs in Aquatic Ecosystems”). These panels failed to study how much of these pollutants come from dairies. See CECs in Aquatic Ecosystems at 17.

Similarly, the Regional Board convened the Emerging Constituents Work Group and approved a monitoring and reporting program. See Santa Ana Regional Board, Order Authorizing Cooperative Agreement, R8-2008-0019 (Jan. 18, 2008); Santa Ana Regional Board, Order Approving Emerging Constituents Monitoring and Reporting Program, R8-2009-0071 (Dec. 10, 2009). However, this program does not require dairies to monitor and report their harmful, unregulated pollutants. To better understand how dairies contribute these pollutants to our waters, the new Dairy Permit should require monitoring and reporting for specific antimicrobials and hormones. Our specific recommendations are included in the Proposed Permit, Section IV(A)(6)(d).


The Dairy Permit requires all dairies to develop an Engineered Waste Management Plan (Waste Plan) and, for those dairies that apply manure, litter, or process wastewater to croplands, a Nutrient Management Plan (Nutrient Plan). Dairy Permit, Section III (E)(1). Currently, dairies update Waste Plans and Nutrient Plans only when a dairy undergoes a “substantial change,” which, for many dairies, has not happened in over twenty years. See Dairy Permit, Section III (E)(6). Additionally, the public has limited access to these plans because the plans are not electronically available. The new Dairy Permit should require dairies to periodically update and revise both Waste Plans and Nutrient Plans, and these plans should be available in electronic format on the Regional Board’s website.

V. All Dairies Should Prepare Emergency Response Plans to Reduce Discharges During an Emergency.

A dairy may significantly pollute local waters if its infrastructure fails. The new Dairy Permit should require all dairies to prepare and implement an Emergency Response Plan. Other states, like Washington and Wisconsin, require dairies to prepare and implement these plans. These plans should be approved by the Regional Board and be electronically available to the public.
VI. **Dairies Should Visually Monitor More Frequently to Reduce or Eliminate Preventable Discharges.**

Unanticipated discharges are often the result of lackluster monitoring and maintenance of key containment areas. The current dairy permit requires the same monitoring for “all containment structures.” Some dairy infrastructure should be monitored more frequently to prevent unanticipated discharges. For example, this Dairy Permit does not require the dairy to prepare for upcoming storm events. Inspecting for problems before a storm event can prevent unanticipated discharges through implementation of appropriate monitoring requirements. Therefore, the new Dairy Permit should specify the frequency needed to appropriately address, monitor, and prevent unanticipated discharges.

We suggest utilizing language from the North Coast (Region 1) permit. This addition designates specific inspection timelines for the production area, holding pond, manure containment structures, animal confinement areas, cropland and pasture, and up and down stream water sources. The new Dairy Permit should require dairies to take a closer look at their facility and incentivize the preemptive addressing of likely discharge sources.

VII. **The new Dairy Permit Should Require Dairies to Call the California Office of Emergency Services Immediately Upon Discharge and the Regional Board Once the Dairy is Back in Compliance With the Permit.**

The new Dairy Permit should require the dairy to call the California Office of Emergency Services when an unanticipated discharge occurs and alert the Regional Board once their facility is back in compliance. Other regions, like San Francisco Bay, require dairies to take these actions when an unanticipated discharge occurs. This information is important to help the Regional Board track and resolve problems.

VIII. **The New Dairy Permit Should Include Structural Changes to Reduce Confusion and Promote Compliance.**

The Regional Board should reorganize the new Dairy Permit and delete language that is repetitive or unnecessary. This will make it easier for dairies, the Regional Board, and the interested public to understand and comply with the Dairy Permit.

Specifically, the new Dairy Permit should:

A. *Directly and explicitly incorporate all the substantive provisions currently contained in the attachments into the body of the permit.*

Other states, like New York and Wisconsin, include all substantive provision in the body of the permit. This will reduce confusion, improve clarity, and promote permit compliance.
B. Update and consolidate the Monitoring and Reporting section in body of the permit.

The new Dairy Permit should contain an updated and consolidated Monitoring and Reporting section that complies with federal law. This will clarify the Dairy Permit’s Monitoring and Reporting requirements and promote compliance and public participation.

C. Designate an Annual Reporting section within the Dairy Permit to provide dairies with a clearly marked consolidated list of required documents.

The new Dairy Permit should clearly identify all documents and reports, including photographs, that dairies must submit in the Annual Report. This will increase compliance, data collection, and transparency.

D. Designate a Record Keeping section that includes a comprehensive list of all documents that dairies are required to maintain on site.

The new Dairy Permit should include a detailed list of all documents that dairies must maintain at the facility. This will promote sound record keeping and help ensure accountability if there is a permit violation.

E. Designate a consolidated Compliance and Enforcement section in the Dairy Permit.

The new Dairy Permit should clearly indicate dairies’ compliance duties and the Regional Board’s supervisory and enforcement obligations.

IX. Conclusion

Waterkeeper appreciates the Regional Board’s dedication towards the development of the new Dairy Permit and for including Waterkeeper as a partner in this process. We look forward to working with the Regional Board to create a new Permit that protects local waters and ensures a viable dairy industry. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Colin Kelly at colin@coastkeeper.org.
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