

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

11020 Sun Center Drive, #200 Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • Fax (916) 464-4645
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

**ORDER R5-2018-0087
NPDES NO. CA0078441**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
CITY OF DUNSMUIR
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SHASTA AND SISKIYOU COUNTIES**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements (WDR's) set forth in this Order:

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	City of Dunsmuir
Name of Facility	Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	1100 South First Street
	Dunsmuir, CA 96025
	Shasta and Siskiyou Counties

Table 2. Discharge Location

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude (North)	Discharge Point Longitude (West)	Receiving Water
001	Treated Effluent	41° 11' 00.207"	122° 17' 00.073"	Sacramento River
002	Treated Effluent	41° 11' 01.577"	122° 16' 58.259"	Percolation Ponds

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was adopted on:	7 December 2018
This Order shall become effective on:	1 February 2019
This Order shall expire on:	31 January 2024
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) as an application for reissuance of WDR's in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than:	31 January 2023
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region have classified this discharge as follows:	Minor

I, Patrick Pulupa, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **7 December 2018**.

Original Signed By:

PATRICK PULUPA, Executive Officer

CONTENTS

I.	Facility Information	3
II.	Findings	3
III.	Discharge Prohibitions	4
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications	4
	A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001	4
	1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001	4
	2. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable	5
	B. Land Discharge Specifications – Discharge Point 002	6
	C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable	6
V.	Receiving Water Limitations	6
	A. Surface Water Limitations	6
	B. Groundwater Limitations	8
VI.	Provisions	8
	A. Standard Provisions	8
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements	12
	C. Special Provisions	12
	1. Reopener Provisions	12
	2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements	13
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention	14
	4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications	15
	5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW's)	16
	6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable	16
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable	16
VII.	Compliance Determination	16

TABLES

Table 1.	Discharger Information	1
Table 2.	Discharge Location	1
Table 3.	Administrative Information	1
Table 4.	Effluent Limitations	5
Table 5.	Land Discharge Specifications	6
Table 6.	Groundwater Limitations	8

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Definitions	A-1
Attachment B – Map	B-1
Attachment C – Flow Schematic	C-1
Attachment D – Standard Provisions	D-1
Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program	E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet	F-1
Attachment G – Summary Of Reasonable Potential Analysis	G-1
Attachment H – Calculation of WQBEL'S	H-1

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the City of Dunsmuir, Wastewater Treatment Plant (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility's permit application.

II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Central Valley Water Board), finds:

- A. Legal Authorities.** This Order serves as waste discharge requirements (WDR's) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit authorizing the Discharger to discharge into waters of the United States at the discharge locations described in Table 2 subject to the WDR's in this Order.
- B. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Central Valley Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order, is hereby incorporated into and constitutes Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G through H are also incorporated into this Order.
- C. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, V.B, and VI.C.4 are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- D. Monitoring and Reporting.** 40 C.F.R. section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and state requirements. The MRP is provided in Attachment E.

The technical and monitoring reports in this Order are required in accordance with Water Code section 13267, which states the following in subsection (b)(1), *"In conducting an investigation specified in subdivision (a), the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region, or any citizen or domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge, waste outside of its region could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports."*

The Discharger owns and operates the Facility subject to this Order. The monitoring reports required by this Order are necessary to determine compliance with this Order. The need for the monitoring reports is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

- E. Notification of Interested Persons.** The Central Valley Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.
- F. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Central Valley Water 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.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R5-2012-0085 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Central Valley Water Board from taking enforcement action for violations of the previous Order.

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A.** Discharge of wastewater from the Facility, as the Facility is specifically described in section II.B of the Fact Sheet, in a manner different from that described in this Order is prohibited.
- B.** The bypass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C.** Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in section 13050 of the Water Code.
- D.** Discharge of waste classified as 'hazardous', as defined in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22, section 66261.1 et seq., is prohibited.
- E.** The direct discharge of treated wastewater to surface waters or surface water drainage courses during the recreation season, 15 June through 15 September, is prohibited.
- F. Average Dry Weather Flow.** Discharges exceeding an average dry weather flow of 0.30 million gallons per day (MGD) at Discharge Points 001 or 002 are prohibited.

IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point 001. Unless otherwise specified, compliance shall be measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001, as described in the MRP, Attachment E:

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 4:

Table 4. Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
Priority Pollutants						
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	29	--	54	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	25	--	72	--	--
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	81	--	140	--	--
Non-Conventional Pollutants						
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	22	45	--	--	--
	lbs/day ¹	55	110	--	--	--

¹ Based on a design average dry weather flow of 0.30 MGD.

- b. **Percent Removal.** The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.
- c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
- 70 percent, minimum for any one bioassay; and
 - 90 percent, median for any three consecutive bioassays.
- d. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:
- 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
 - 0.019 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.
- e. **Total Coliform Organisms.** From 16 November through 30 April, effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed the following:
- 23 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
 - 240 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period.
- f. **Total Coliform Organisms.** From 1 May through 14 June and 16 September through 15 November, effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed the following:
- 2.2 MPN per 100 mL, as a 7-day median;
 - 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and
 - 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

2. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

B. Land Discharge Specifications – Discharge Point 002

1. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following land discharge specifications at Discharge Point 002. Unless otherwise specified, compliance shall be measured at Monitoring Location LND-00A, as described in the MRP, Attachment E:
 - a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 5:

Table 5. Land Discharge Specifications

Parameter	Units	Land Discharge Specifications				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--

- b. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed the following:
 - i. 23 MPN per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
 - ii. 240 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period.

C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water Limitations

The discharge shall not cause the following in the Sacramento River:

1. **Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than 10 percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
2. **Biostimulatory Substances.** Water to contain biostimulatory substances that promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
3. **Chemical Constituents.** Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
4. **Color.** Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
5. **Dissolved Oxygen:**
 - a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass;
 - b. The 95th percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor
 - c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time.

6. **Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. **Oil and Grease.** Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.
9. **Pesticides:**
 - a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
 - b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
 - c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by U.S. EPA or the Executive Officer;
 - d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution 68-16 and 40 C.F.R. section 131.12);
 - e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable;
 - f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCL's) set forth in CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 15 (Title 22); nor
 - g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.
10. **Radioactivity:**
 - a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
 - b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the MCL's specified in Table 64442 of section 64442 and Table 64443 of section 64443 of Title 22 of the CCR.
11. **Suspended Sediments.** The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
12. **Settleable Substances.** Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
13. **Suspended Material.** Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
14. **Taste and Odors.** Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
15. **Temperature.** The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F. Compliance to be determined based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. Temperature changes due to controllable factors shall be limited as described below. To the extent of any conflict with the above temperature objective, the more stringent objective applies.

- a. From 1 December to 15 March, the maximum temperature shall be 55°F.
 - b. From 16 March to 15 April, the maximum temperature shall be 60°F.
 - c. From 16 April to 15 May, the maximum temperature shall be 65°F.
 - d. From 16 May to 15 October, the maximum temperature shall be 70°F.
 - e. From 16 October to 15 November, the maximum temperature shall be 65°F.
 - f. From 16 November to 30 November, the maximum temperature shall be 60°F.
16. **Toxicity.** Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
17. **Turbidity.**
- a. Shall not exceed 2 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU;
 - b. Shall not increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTU;
 - c. Shall not increase more than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTU;
 - d. Shall not increase more than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTU; and
 - e. Shall not increase more than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTU.

B. Groundwater Limitations

1. The discharge shall not cause the groundwater to exceed water quality objectives, unreasonably affect beneficial uses, or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance.
2. Release of waste constituents from any portion of the Facility shall not cause or contribute to, in combination with other sources of waste constituents, groundwater within influence of the Facility to contain:
 - a. Waste constituent concentrations in excess of the concentrations specified below or background water quality, whichever is greater.

Table 6. Groundwater Limitations

Parameter	Units	Maximum Limitation
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	<2.2
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	10

- b. Impart taste, odor, chemical constituents, toxicity, or color that creates nuisance or impairs any beneficial use.

VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:
 - a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and

operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, division 3, chapter 26.

- b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:
 - i. Violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;
 - ii. Obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;
 - iii. A change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and
 - iv. A material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

- i. *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under section 405(d) of the CWA, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.
- ii. *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.
- iii. *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 C.F.R. section 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

The Central Valley Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Central Valley Water Board's own motion.

- c. If a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any scheduled compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under section 307(a) of the CWA, or amendments thereto, for a toxic pollutant that is present in the discharge authorized herein, and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in this Order, the Central Valley Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards and prohibitions within the time provided in the regulations that establish those standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified.

- d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
 - i. Contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or
 - ii. Controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

The Order, as modified or reissued under this paragraph, shall also contain any other requirements of the CWA then applicable.

- e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.
- f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the state or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include such accelerated or additional monitoring as necessary to determine the nature and impact of the non-complying discharge or sludge use or disposal.
- g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by U.S. EPA under section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.
- h. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the Facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
- i. Safeguard to electric power failure:
 - i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.
 - ii. Upon written request by the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
 - iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Central Valley Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Central Valley Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Central Valley Water Board and U.S. EPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Central Valley Water Board, become a condition of this Order.
- j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under the Central Valley Water Board Standard Provision contained in section VI.A.2.i of this Order.

The technical report shall:

- i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.

- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.
- iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Central Valley Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions that it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

- k. A publicly owned treatment works whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Central Valley Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.
- l. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with CCR, Title 16, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.
- m. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- n. 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 shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board.

To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the state of incorporation if a corporation, address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Central Valley Water Board and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory and certification requirements in the Federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D, section V.B) and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a

violation of the Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

- o. 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.
- p. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation of this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by telephone (530) 224-4845 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such non-compliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within 5 days, unless the Central Valley Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall state the nature, time, duration, and cause of non-compliance, and shall describe the measures being taken to remedy the current non-compliance and prevent recurrence including, where applicable, a schedule of implementation. Other non-compliance requires written notification as above at the time of the normal monitoring report.

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements

The Discharger shall comply with the MRP, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E.

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 C.F.R. section 122.62, including, but not limited to:
 - i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.
 - ii. When new information that was not available at the time of permit issuance would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
- b. This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not limited to, fish tissue sampling, WET, monitoring requirements on internal waste stream(s), and monitoring for surrogate parameters. Additional requirements may be included in this Order as a result of the special condition monitoring data.
- c. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and an effluent limitation shall be imposed. If the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) or Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES), this Order may be reopened to include a revised chronic toxicity effluent limitation, a revised acute toxicity effluent limitation, and/or an effluent limitation for a specific toxicant identified in a TRE. Additionally, if

the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions, this Order may be reopened to implement the new provisions.

- e. **Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WER's and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- f. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013 the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2013-0098 amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking Water Policy. The State Water Board approved the Drinking Water Policy on 3 December 2013. This Order may be reopened to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.
- g. **Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS).** On 31 May 2018, as part of the CV-SALTS initiative, the Central Valley Water Board approved Basin Plan Amendments to incorporate new strategies for addressing ongoing salt and nitrate accumulation in the Central Valley. If approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA, the Amendments would impose certain new requirements on salt and nitrate discharges. More information regarding these Amendments can be found at the following link:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/salinity/

If the Amendments ultimately go into effect, this Order may be amended or modified to incorporate any newly-applicable requirements.

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Requirements.** This provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the chronic toxicity thresholds defined in this Special Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with the TRE Work Plan approved on 10 April 2013, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent recurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a step-wise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TRE's are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of WET, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. Alternatively, under certain conditions, as described below, the Discharger may participate in an approved TES in lieu of conducting a site-specific TRE.
 - i. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is 1 chronic toxicity units (TU_c) (where TU_c = 100/NOEC). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to initiate additional actions to evaluate effluent toxicity as specified in subsection ii, below.
 - ii. **Chronic Toxicity Monitoring Trigger Exceeded.** When a chronic WET result during routine monitoring exceeds the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall proceed as follows:
 - (a) **Initial Toxicity Check.** If the result is less than or equal to 1.3 TU_c (as 100/EC₂₅) AND/OR the percent effect is less than 25 percent at

100 percent effluent, check for any operation or sample collection issues and return to routine chronic toxicity monitoring. Otherwise, proceed to step (b).

- (b) **Evaluate 6-Week Median.** The Discharger may take two additional samples within 6 weeks of the initial routine sampling event exceeding the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger to evaluate compliance using a 6-week median. If the 6-week median is greater than 1.3 TUC (as 100/EC₂₅) and the percent effect is greater than 25 percent at 100 percent effluent, proceed with subsection (c). Otherwise, the Discharger shall check for any operation or sample collection issues and return to routine chronic toxicity monitoring.
- (c) **Toxicity Source Easily Identified.** If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (e.g., temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the Facility and shall resume routine chronic toxicity monitoring. If the source of toxicity is not easily identified, the Discharger shall conduct a site-specific TRE or participate in an approved TES as described in the following subsections.
- (d) **Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES).** If the percent effect is ≤ 50 percent at 100 percent effluent, as the median of up to three consecutive chronic toxicity tests within a 6-week period, the Discharger may participate in an approved TES in lieu of a site-specific TRE. The TES may be conducted individually or as part of a coordinated group effort with other similar dischargers. If the Discharger chooses not to participate in an approved TES, a site-specific TRE shall be initiated in accordance with subsection (e)(1), below. Nevertheless, the Discharger may participate in an approved TES instead of a TRE if the Discharger has conducted a site-specific TRE within the past 12 months and has been unsuccessful in identifying the toxicant.
- (e) **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE).** If the percent effect is > 50 percent at 100 percent effluent, as the median of three consecutive chronic toxicity tests within a 6-week period, the Discharger shall initiate a site-specific TRE as follows:
 - (1) **Within 30 days** of exceeding the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Central Valley Water Board including, at minimum:
 - Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including a TRE WET monitoring schedule;
 - Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
 - A schedule for these actions.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger shall continue to implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to identify and address sources of salinity discharged from the Facility.

If the effluent annual average calendar year electrical conductivity concentration exceeds 700 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ during the term of this Order, the Discharger shall evaluate the effectiveness of the salinity evaluation and minimization plan and provide a summary with the ROWD, due 1 year prior to the expiration date of this Order.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

a. Percolation Pond Operating Requirements

- i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
- ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable means.
- iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,
 - (a) An erosion control program shall be implemented to assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface;
 - (b) Weeds shall be minimized;
 - (c) Vegetation, debris, and dead algae shall not be allowed to accumulate on the water surface; and
 - (d) Other control programs shall be implemented in consultation with mosquito abatement.
- iv. Freeboard in the network of ponds shall not be less than 2 feet (measures vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- v. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary inflow and infiltration (I&I) during the non-irrigation season. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- vi. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with the Land Discharge Specifications in section IV.B, above.
- vii. The discharge of waste classified as "hazardous" as defined in section 2521(a) of CCR, Title 23, or "designated," as defined in section 13173 of the California Water Code, to the treatment ponds is prohibited.
- viii. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger).
- ix. As a means of discerning compliance with the Land Discharge Specifications, the dissolved oxygen content in the upper zone (1 foot) of wastewater in the ponds shall not be less than 1.0 mg/L.
- x. Ponds shall not have a pH less than 6.0 or greater than 9.0.

5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works

- a. **Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications.** Sludge in this document means the solid, semisolid, and liquid residues removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment processes. Solid waste refers to grit and screening material generated during preliminary treatment. Residual sludge means sludge that will not be subject to further treatment at the Facility. Biosolids refer to sludge that has been treated and tested and shown to be capable of being beneficially and legally used pursuant to federal and state regulations as a soil amendment for agricultural, silvicultural, horticultural, and land reclamation activities, as specified under 40 C.F.R. part 503.

- i. Collected screenings, residual sludge, biosolids, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer, and consistent with Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing, or Disposal of Solid Waste, as set forth in CCR, Title 27, division 2, subdivision 1, section 20005, et seq. Removal for further treatment, storage, disposal, or reuse at sites (e.g., landfill, composting sites, and soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid WDR's issued by a Regional Water Board will satisfy these specifications.

Sludge and solid waste shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, clarifiers, etc. as needed to ensure optimal plant performance.

The treatment of sludge generated at the Facility shall be confined to the Facility property and conducted in a manner that precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations in section V.B of this Order. In addition, the storage of residual sludge, solid waste, and biosolids on Facility property shall be temporary and controlled, and contained in a manner that minimizes leachate formation and precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations included in section V.B of this Order.

- ii. The use, disposal, storage, and transportation of biosolids shall comply with existing federal and state laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 C.F.R. part 503. If the State Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 C.F.R. part 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 C.F.R. part 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.
- iii. The on-site sludge/biosolids treatment, processing, and storage for the Facility is described in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, section II.A). Any proposed change in the on-site treatment, processing, or storage of sludge/biosolids shall be reported to the Executive Officer at least **90 days** in advance of the change and shall not be implemented until written approval by the Executive Officer.

6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

- A. **BOD₅ and TSS Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications (Sections IV.A.1.a, IV.A.1.b, and IV.B.1.a).** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS

required in Waste Discharge Requirements sections IV.A.1.a and IV.B.1.a shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations required in Waste Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.b for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD₅ and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

- B. Average Dry Weather Flow Prohibition (Section III.F).** The average dry weather discharge flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the average dry weather flow prohibition will be determined annually based on the average daily flow over three consecutive dry weather months (e.g., July, August, and September).
- C. Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications (Sections IV.A.1.e, IV.A.1.f, and IV.B.1.b).** For each day that an effluent sample is collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms, the 7-day median shall be determined by calculating the median concentration of total coliform bacteria in the effluent utilizing the bacteriological results of the last 7 days. For example, if a sample is collected on a Wednesday, the result from that sampling event and all results from the previous 6 days (i.e., Tuesday, Monday, Sunday, Saturday, Friday, and Thursday) are used to calculate the 7-day median. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a MPN of 23 per 100 milliliters from 16 November through 30 April or an MPN of 2.2 per 100 milliliters from 1 May through 14 June and 16 September through 15 November at Discharge Point 001, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance. Additionally, if the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a MPN of 23 per 100 milliliters at Discharge Point 002, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance.
- D. Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.d).** Continuous monitoring analyzers for chlorine residual or for dechlorination agent residual in the effluent are appropriate methods for compliance determination. A positive residual dechlorination agent in the effluent indicates that chlorine is not present in the discharge, which demonstrates compliance with the effluent limitations. This type of monitoring can also be used to prove that some chlorine residual exceedances are false positives. Continuous monitoring data showing either a positive dechlorination agent residual or a chlorine residual at or below the prescribed limit are sufficient to show compliance with the total residual chlorine effluent limitations, as long as the instruments are maintained and calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

Any excursion above the 1-hour average or 4-day average total residual chlorine effluent limitations is a violation. If the Discharger conducts continuous monitoring and the Discharger can demonstrate, through data collected from a back-up monitoring system, that a chlorine spike recorded by the continuous monitor was not actually due to chlorine, then any excursion resulting from the recorded spike will not be considered an exceedance, but rather reported as a false positive. Records supporting validation of false positives shall be maintained in accordance with section IV of the Standard Provisions (Attachment D).

- E. Mass Effluent Limitations.** The mass effluent limitations contained in section IV.A.1.a are based on the permitted average dry weather flow and calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34 \text{ (conversion factor)}$$

If the effluent flow exceeds the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations contained in Waste Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a shall not apply. If the effluent flow is below the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations do apply.

- F. Priority Pollutant Effluent Limitations.** Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants shall be determined in accordance with section 2.4.5 of the SIP, as follows:
1. Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reporting level (RL).
 2. Dischargers shall be required to conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) in accordance with section 2.4.5.1 of the SIP when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:
 - a. A sample result is reported as detected, but not quantified (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or
 - b. A sample result is reported as non-detect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL).
 3. When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and more than one sample result is available in a month or with an average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL) and more than one sample result is available in a week, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the Discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
 - a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
 - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
 4. If a sample result, or the arithmetic mean or median of multiple sample results, is below the RL, and there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and the Discharger conducts a PMP (as described in section 2.4.5.1), the Discharger shall not be deemed out of compliance.
- G. Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitation (Section V.A.5.a-c).** The Facility provides a high level of treatment, including filtration and nitrification, which results in minimal dissolved oxygen impacts in the receiving water. Receiving water monitoring for dissolved oxygen is required once per week in the MRP (Attachment E) and is sufficient to evaluate the impacts of the discharge and compliance with this Order. Receiving water monitoring data, measured at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002, will be used to determine compliance with part "c" of the dissolved oxygen receiving water limitation to ensure the discharge does not cause the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the Sacramento River to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time. However, should more frequent dissolved oxygen and temperature receiving water monitoring be conducted, Central Valley Water Board staff may evaluate compliance with parts "a" and "b".
- H. Temperature Receiving Water Limitation (Section V.A.15).** Compliance with the temperature receiving water limitations will be determined based on the difference in the temperature measured at Monitoring Location RSW-001 compared to the downstream temperature measured at Monitoring Location RSW-002.

- I. **Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations (Section V.A.17.a-e).** Compliance with the turbidity receiving water limitations will be determined based on the change in turbidity measured at Monitoring Location RSW-001 compared to the downstream turbidity measured at Monitoring Location RSW-002.



ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

Arithmetic Mean (μ)

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

Arithmetic mean = $\mu = \Sigma x / n$ where: Σx is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and n is the number of samples.

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

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

Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

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

Bioaccumulative

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

Carcinogenic

Pollutants are substances that are known to cause cancer in living organisms.

Coefficient of Variation (CV)

CV is a measure of the data variability and is calculated as the estimated standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean of the observed values.

Daily Discharge

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

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

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

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

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

Dilution Credit

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

Effect Concentration (EC)

A point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause an observable adverse effect (e.g. death, immobilization, or serious incapacitation) in a given percent of the test organisms, calculated from a continuous model (e.g. Probit Model). EC_{25} is a point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause an observable adverse effect in 25 percent of the test organisms.

Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)

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

Enclosed Bays

Enclosed Bays means indentations along the coast that enclose an area of oceanic water within distinct headlands or harbor works. Enclosed bays include all bays where the narrowest distance between the headlands or outermost harbor works is less than 75 percent of the greatest dimension of the enclosed portion of the bay. Enclosed bays include, but are not limited to, Humboldt Bay, Bodega Harbor, Tomales Bay, Drake's Estero, San Francisco Bay, Morro Bay, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Upper and Lower Newport Bay, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay. Enclosed bays do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

Endpoint

An effect that is measured in a toxicity study. Endpoints in toxicity tests may include, but are not limited to survival, reproduction, and growth.

Estimated Chemical Concentration

The estimated chemical concentration that results from the confirmed detection of the substance by the analytical method below the ML value.

Estuaries

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

Inhibition Concentration

Inhibition Concentration (IC) is a point estimate of the toxicant concentration that would cause a given percent reduction in a non-lethal biological measurement (e.g., reproduction or growth), calculated from a continuous model (i.e., Interpolation Method). IC_{25} is a point estimate of the toxic concentration that would cause a 25-percent reduction in a non-lethal biological measurement.

Inland Surface Waters

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

Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation

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

Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation

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

Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

The highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.

Median

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

Method Detection Limit (MDL)

MDL is the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

Minimum Level (ML)

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

Mixing Zone

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

No-Observed-Effect-Concentration (NOEC)

The highest concentration of toxicant to which organisms are exposed in a full life-cycle or partial life-cycle (short-term) test, that causes no observable adverse effects on the test organisms (i.e., the highest concentration of toxicant in which the values for the observed responses are not statistically significantly different from the controls).

Not Detected (ND)

Sample results which are less than the laboratory's MDL.

Ocean Waters

The territorial marine waters of the State as defined by California law to the extent these waters are outside of enclosed bays, estuaries, and coastal lagoons. Discharges to ocean waters are regulated in accordance with the State Water Board's California Ocean Plan.

Percent Effect

The percent effect at the instream waste concentration (IWC) shall be calculated using untransformed data and the following equation:

$$\text{Percent Effect of the Sample} = \frac{\text{Mean Control Response} - \text{Mean Sample Response}}{\text{Mean Control Response}} \cdot 100$$

Persistent Pollutants

Persistent pollutants are substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

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

Pollution Prevention

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

Satellite Collection System

The portion, if any, of a sanitary sewer system owned or operated by a different public agency than the agency that owns and operates the wastewater treatment facility that a sanitary sewer system is tributary to.

Source of Drinking Water

Any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Central Valley Water Board Basin Plan.

Standard Deviation (σ)

Standard Deviation is a measure of variability that is calculated as follows:

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

where:


- x is the observed value;
- μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and
- n is the number of samples.

Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)


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

B.

ATTACHMENT B – MAP



ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC



D.

ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the terms, requirements, and conditions of this Order. Any non-compliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action; permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a); Wat. Code, §§ 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 13001, 13304, 13350, 13385)
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 this Order has not yet 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 this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c))

C. Duty to Mitigate

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

D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

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

E. Property Rights

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

F. Inspection and Entry

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

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3); Wat. Code, § 13267, 13383); and
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. (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383)

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, I.G.4, and I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2))
3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Central Valley Water 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 Central Valley Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C))
4. The Central Valley Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Central Valley Water 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 prior notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. The notice shall be sent to the Central Valley Water Board. As of 21 December 2020, all notices shall be submitted electronically to the initial recipient (State Water Board), defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J below. Notices shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i))
- b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit a notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). The notice shall be sent to the Central Valley Water Board. As of 21 December 2020, all notices shall be submitted electronically to the initial recipient (State Water Board), defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J below. Notices shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii))

H. Upset

Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary non-compliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include non-compliance 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 non-compliance 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 non-compliance was caused by upset, and before an action for non-compliance, 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
 - d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv))
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. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION

A. General

This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Discharger for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated non-compliance 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 this Order after the expiration date of this Order, the Discharger must apply for and obtain a new permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b))

C. Transfers

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Central Valley Water Board. The Central Valley Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and the Water Code. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(3); 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 must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O. Monitoring must be conducted according to sufficiently sensitive test methods approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analysis of pollutants or pollutant parameters or as required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O. For the purposes of this paragraph, a method is sufficiently sensitive when the method has the lowest ML of the analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, or when:

1. The method minimum level (ML) is at or below the level of the most stringent effluent limitation established in the permit for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, and:
 - a. The method ML is at or below the level of the most stringent applicable water quality criterion for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, or;
 - b. The method ML is above the applicable water quality criterion but the amount of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the facility's discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the discharge;

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

IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

- A.** Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Discharger's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. part 503), the Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Central Valley Water 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 Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383)

B. Signatory and Certification Requirements

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, V.B.5, and V.B.6 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k))
2. All permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of U.S. EPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3))

3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA 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 Central Valley Water Board and State Water 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 Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c))
5. 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))
6. Any person providing the electronic signature for such documents described in Standard Provision – V.B.1, V.B.2, or V.B.3 that are submitted electronically shall meet all relevant requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B, and shall ensure that all of the relevant requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 3 (Cross-Media Electronic Reporting) and 40 C.F.R. part 127 (NPDES Electronic Reporting Requirements) are met for that submission. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(e))

C. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4))
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board for reporting the results of monitoring, sludge use, or disposal practices. As of 21 December 2016, all reports and forms must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient, defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J, and comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i))

3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Central Valley Water 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 this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii))

D. Compliance Schedules

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

E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

The Discharger shall report any non-compliance which may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A report shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The report shall contain a description of the non-compliance and its cause; the period of non-compliance, including exact dates and times, and if the non-compliance 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 non-compliance.

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

As of 21 December 2020, all reports related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient (State Water Board) defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J. The reports shall comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3. The may also require the Discharger to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i))

F. Planned Changes

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

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or
2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii))

The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's sludge 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 disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan.
(40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(iii))

G. Anticipated Non-compliance

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Central Valley Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in non-compliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(2))

H. Other Non-compliance

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

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 Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8))

J. Initial Recipient for Electronic Reporting Data

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

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

- A.** The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13350, 13385, 13386, and 13387.

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW's)

All POTW's shall provide adequate notice to the Central Valley Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and
2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2))

3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW.
(40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3))

E.

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Contents

I.	General Monitoring Provisions	E-2
II.	Monitoring Locations	E-3
III.	Influent Monitoring Requirements	E-4
	A. Monitoring Location INF-001	E-4
IV.	Effluent Monitoring Requirements	E-4
	A. Monitoring Location EFF-001	E-4
V.	Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing Requirements	E-5
VI.	Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements	E-8
	A. Monitoring Location LND-00A	E-8
VII.	Recycling Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable	E-9
VIII.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements	E-9
	A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002	E-9
	B. Monitoring Locations RGW-001 through RGW-010, excepting RGW-002 and RGW-008 ..	E-10
IX.	Other Monitoring Requirements	E-11
	A. Biosolids – Not Applicable	E-11
	B. Municipal Water Supply	E-11
	C. Percolation Ponds	E-11
	D. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization	E-12
X.	Reporting Requirements	E-16
	A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	E-16
	B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMR's)	E-16
	C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's)	E-19
	D. Other Reports	E-19

Tables

Table E-1.	Monitoring Station Locations	E-3
Table E-2.	Influent Monitoring	E-4
Table E-3.	Effluent Monitoring	E-4
Table E-4.	Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series	E-7
Table E-5.	Land Discharge Monitoring	E-8
Table E-6.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements	E-9
Table E-7.	Groundwater Monitoring Requirements	E-10
Table E-8.	Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements	E-11
Table E-9.	Percolation Pond Monitoring Requirements	E-12
Table E-10.	Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring	E-12
Table E-11.	Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule	E-17
Table E-12.	Technical Reports	E-20

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 C.F.R. § 122.48) requires that all National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and California regulations.

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

- A.** Samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. All samples shall be taken at the monitoring locations specified below and, unless otherwise specified, before the monitored flow joins or is diluted by any other waste stream, body of water, or substance. Monitoring locations shall not be changed without notification to and the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
- B.** Final effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.
- C.** Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted by a laboratory accredited for such analyses by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Drinking Water (DDW; formerly the Department of Public Health). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. In the event an accredited laboratory is not available to the Discharger for any on-site field measurements such as pH, dissolved oxygen, electrical conductivity, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine, such analyses performed by a non-accredited laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program for any on-site field measurements such as pH, dissolved oxygen, electrical conductivity, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine must be kept on-site in the Facility laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Central Valley Water Board staff. The Discharger must demonstrate sufficient capability (qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments, etc.) to adequately perform these field measurements. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to U.S. EPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Central Valley Water Board.
- D.** Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.
- E.** Monitoring results, including non-compliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this MRP.
- F.** Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be accredited by DDW, in accordance with the provision of Water Code section 13176, and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports.
- G.** The Discharger shall ensure that the results of the Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study or the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Board at the following address:

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

- H. The Discharger shall file with the Central Valley Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this MRP.
- I. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board and shall be submitted in such a format as to allow direct comparison with the limitations and requirements of this Order. Unless otherwise specified, discharge flows shall be reported in terms of the monthly average and the daily maximum discharge flows.

II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

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

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	A location where a representative sample of the influent into the Facility can be collected prior to entering into the treatment process.
001	EFF-001	A location where a representative sample of the effluent from the Facility can be collected at the composite machine (suction tubing approximately 10 feet downstream of sulfur dioxide injection) or at the outfall of the sulfur dioxide contact chamber to the Sacramento River between percolation pond 1 and percolation pond 2.
002	LND-00A	A location where a representative sample of the effluent from the Facility can be collected from the end of the chlorine contact chamber at the V-Notch Weir.
--	LND-001	A location where a representative sample of the wastewater in percolation pond 1 can be collected.
--	LND-002	A location where a representative sample of the wastewater in percolation pond 2 can be collected.
--	LND-003	A location where a representative sample of the wastewater in percolation pond 3 can be collected.
--	LND-004	A location where a representative sample of the wastewater in percolation pond 4 can be collected.
--	LND-005	A location where a representative sample of the wastewater in percolation pond 5 can be collected.
--	RSW-001	Sacramento River, west bank, approximately 100 feet below the confluence of Little Castle Creek.
--	RSW-002	Sacramento River, approximately 1,100 feet downstream of Discharge Point 001, adjacent to percolation pond 5.
--	RGW-001, RGW-003, RGW-004, RGW-005, RGW-006, RGW-007, RGW-009, and RGW-010	Groundwater monitoring wells 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10.
--	Source-001	A location where a representative sample of the municipal water supply can be obtained.

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

1. The Discharger shall monitor influent to the Facility at Monitoring Location INF-001 as follows:

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
Conventional Pollutants				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Week	²
pH	standard units	Grab	3/Week	²
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Week	²

¹ 24-hour flow proportional composite.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

1. When discharging to the Sacramento River, the Discharger shall monitor treated effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as follows. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding Minimum Level (ML):

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
Conventional Pollutants				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20° C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Week	²
pH	standard units	Grab	3/Week ^{3,4}	²
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Week	²
Priority Pollutants				
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	^{2,5}
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	^{2,5}
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	^{2,5}
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Alkalinity	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	²
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	2/Month ^{3,6}	²
	lbs/day	Calculate	2/Month	--
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	Meter	Continuous	^{2,7}
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	²
Hardness, Total (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month ⁸	²
Standard Minerals ⁹	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	²

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Temperature	°C	Grab	2/Month ^{3,4}	2
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/Week ¹⁰	2
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	2
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	2/Month ⁴	2

¹ 24-hour flow proportional composite.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

³ pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.

⁴ A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this MRP shall be maintained at the Facility.

⁵ For priority pollutant constituents, the reporting level (RL) shall be consistent with sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, section IX.D).

⁶ Concurrent with whole effluent toxicity (WET) monitoring.

⁷ Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L.

⁸ Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

⁹ Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

¹⁰ Total coliform organisms samples may be collected at any point following disinfection.

2. If the discharge is intermittent rather than continuous, then on the first day of each such intermittent discharge, the Discharger shall monitor and record, for all of the constituents listed above, after which the frequencies of analysis given in the schedule shall apply for the duration of each such intermittent discharge. In no event shall the Discharger be required to monitor and record data more often than twice the frequencies listed in the schedule.

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY (WET) TESTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Acute Toxicity Testing. The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing acute toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following acute toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – When discharging to the Sacramento River, the Discharger shall perform semi-annual acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia, temperature, and pH sampling.
2. Sample Types – The Discharger may use flow-through or static renewal testing. For static renewal testing, the samples shall be grab samples and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001.
3. Test Species – Test species shall be rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).
4. Methods – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be

recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.

5. Test Failure – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 7 days following notification of test failure.

B. Chronic Toxicity Testing. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform routine annual chronic toxicity testing within 30 days of commencing discharges to the Sacramento River. If the result of the routine chronic toxicity testing event exhibits toxicity, demonstrated by a result greater than 1.3 chronic toxicity units (TUC) (as 100/NOEC) AND a percent effect greater than 25 percent at 100 percent effluent, the Discharger has the option of conducting two additional compliance monitoring events and performing chronic toxicity testing using the species that exhibited toxicity in order to calculate a median. The optional compliance monitoring events shall occur at least 1 week apart, and the final monitoring event shall be initiated no later than 6 weeks from the routine monitoring event that exhibited toxicity.
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be flow proportional 24-hour composites and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001 and taken concurrently with ammonia, temperature, and pH sampling.
3. Sample Volumes – Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.
4. Test Species – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:
 - a. The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
 - b. The fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (larval survival and growth test); and
 - c. The green alga, *Selenastrum capricornutum* (growth test).
5. Methods – The presence of chronic toxicity shall be estimated as specified in *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual).
6. Reference Toxicant – As required by the State Implementation Policy (SIP), all chronic toxicity tests shall be conducted with concurrent testing with a reference toxicant and shall be reported with the chronic toxicity test results.
7. Dilutions – For routine and compliance chronic toxicity monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-4, below. For Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-4, below, unless an alternative dilution series is detailed in the submitted TRE Action Plan. A receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series

Sample	Dilutions ¹ (%)					Control
	100	75	50	25	14.3	
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	12.5	0
% Control Water	0	25	50	75	87.5	100

¹ Receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

8. **Test Failure** – The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than 14 days after receiving notification of a test failure. A test failure is defined as follows:
 - a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the Method Manual, and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or
 - b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in the Method Manual.
- C. WET Testing Notification Requirements.** The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board within 24 hours after the receipt of test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during regular or accelerated monitoring, or an exceedance of the acute toxicity effluent limitation.
- D. WET Testing Reporting Requirements.** All toxicity test reports shall include the contracting laboratory's complete report provided to the Discharger and shall be in accordance with the appropriate "Report Preparation and Test Review" sections of the method manuals. At a minimum, WET monitoring shall be reported as follows:
 1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Routine and compliance chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board with the monthly SMR, and shall contain, at minimum:
 - a. The results expressed in TUC, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as 100/LC50, 100/EC25, 100/IC25, and 100/IC50, as appropriate;
 - b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;
 - c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the PMSD;
 - d. The dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test; and
 - e. The results compared to the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger.

Additionally, the monthly SMR's shall contain an updated chronology of chronic toxicity test results expressed in TUC, and organized by test species, type of test (survival, growth or reproduction), and monitoring type, i.e., routine, compliance, Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES), or TRE monitoring.
 2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the monthly SMR's and reported as percent survival.
 3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for TRE's shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Work Plan, or as amended by the Discharger's TRE Action Plan.
 4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:

- a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.
- b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.
- c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location LND-00A

1. When discharging to the percolation ponds, the Discharger shall monitor treated effluent at Monitoring Location LND-00A as follows. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding ML:

Table E-5. Land Discharge Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
Conventional Pollutants				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20° C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Week	2
pH	standard units	Grab	3/Week ³	2
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Week	2
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Chloride	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	2
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month	2
Hardness, Total (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	2
Iron	µg/L	Grab	1/Year	2
Manganese	µg/L	Grab	1/Year	2
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	2
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/Week	2
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	2

¹ 24-hour flow proportional composite.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

³ A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this MRP shall be maintained at the Facility.

VII. RECYCLING MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002 as follows:

Table E-6. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	1/Day ^{1,9}	--
Conventional Pollutants				
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Week ^{2,3}	4
Priority Pollutants				
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	2/Year ¹	4,5
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	2/Year ¹	4,5
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	2/Year ¹	4,5
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Year ^{1,2,6}	4
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Week ³	4
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Week ³	4
Hardness, Total (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month ^{3,7}	4
Standard Minerals ⁸	mg/L	Grab	1/Year ¹	4
Temperature	°C	Grab	1/Week ^{2,3}	4
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	2/Month	4
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Year ¹	4
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	2/Month ³	4

¹ Monitoring required at Monitoring Location RSW-001 only.

² pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.

³ A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this MRP shall be maintained at the Facility.

⁴ Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

⁵ For priority pollutant constituents, the RL shall be consistent with sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, section IX.D).

⁶ Concurrent with WET monitoring.

⁷ Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

⁸ Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

⁹ Flow monitoring is currently measured at a staff gauge located upstream of Monitoring Location RSW-001 at the Scherrer Avenue bridge. When the Discharger installs a new gauge at Monitoring Location RSW-002, flow monitoring will be required at RSW-002 only.

2. In conducting receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:
 - a. Floating of suspended matter;
 - b. Discoloration;
 - c. Bottom deposits;
 - d. Aquatic life;
 - e. Visible films, sheens, or coatings;
 - f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths; and
 - g. Potential nuisance conditions.

Notes on receiving water conditions shall be summarized in the monitoring report.

B. Monitoring Locations RGW-001 through RGW-010, excepting RGW-002 and RGW-008

1. Order R5-2012-0085 included a groundwater monitoring network consisting of 10 wells (RGW-001 through RGW-10). Improvements to the Facility have rendered two of the wells (RGW-002 and RGW-008) inoperable. The Discharger's Groundwater Monitoring Network Analysis Workplan concluded that two upgradient wells (RGW-004 and RGW-006) and two downgradient wells (RGW-005 and RGW-010) would be sufficient to capture data for future analysis. Central Valley Water Board staff agree; therefore, this Order includes groundwater monitoring requirements for wells RGW-004, RGW-005, RGW-006, and RGW-010, as specified below. The Discharger is no longer required to monitor wells RGW-002 and RGW-008. For monitoring wells RGW-001, RGW-003, RGW-007, and RGW-009, the Discharger is only required to monitor depth to groundwater on a quarterly basis, according to the requirements in Table E-7.

Prior to construction and/or beginning a sampling program of any new groundwater monitoring wells, the Discharger shall submit plans and specifications to the Central Valley Water Board for approval. Once installed, all new wells shall be added to the monitoring network and shall be sampled and analyzed according to the schedule below. All samples shall be collected using U.S. EPA-approved methods. Water table elevations shall be calculated to determine groundwater gradient and direction of flow.

2. Prior to sampling, the groundwater elevations shall be measured and the wells shall be purged of at least three well volumes until temperature, pH, and electrical conductivity have stabilized. Groundwater monitoring at Monitoring Locations RGW-004, RGW-005, RGW-006, and RGW-010, and any new groundwater monitoring wells shall include, at a minimum, the monitoring in Table E-7, below:

Table E-7. Groundwater Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Depth to Groundwater	±0.01 feet	Measurement	1/Quarter	--
Groundwater Elevation ¹	±0.01 feet	Calculate	1/Quarter	--
Gradient	feet/feet	Calculate	1/Quarter	--
Gradient Direction	degrees	Calculate	1/Quarter	--
Conventional Pollutants				
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Quarter	²
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Ammonia (as NH ₄)	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	²
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Quarter	²

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Metals ³	µg/L	Grab	1/Year	²
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	²
Standard Minerals ⁴	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	²
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/Quarter	²
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	²
Total Nitrogen	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	²

¹ Groundwater elevation shall be determined based on depth-to-water measurements from a surveyed measuring point elevation on the well. The groundwater elevation shall be used to calculate the direction and gradient of groundwater flow, which must be reported.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

³ At a minimum, the following metals shall be included; arsenic, copper, lead, iron, manganese, nickel, and zinc. Analytical methods shall be selected to provide RL's below the water quality limit for each constituent.

⁴ Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Biosolids – Not Applicable

B. Municipal Water Supply

1. Monitoring Location SPL-001

- The Discharger shall monitor the municipal water supply at Monitoring Location SPL-001 as follows:

Table E-8. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C ¹	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Year	²
Standard Minerals ³	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	²
Total Dissolved Solids ¹	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	²

¹ If the water supply is from more than one source, electrical conductivity and total dissolved solids shall be reported as weighted averages and copies of supporting calculations shall be included.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

³ Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

C. Percolation Ponds

1. Monitoring Locations LND-001, LND-002, LND-003, LND-004, and LND-005

- The Discharger shall monitor the percolation ponds at Monitoring Locations LND-001, LND-002, LND-003, LND-004, and LND-005 as follows:

Table E-9. Percolation Pond Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Freeboard	feet	Measure	1/Day	--
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Week	1
Levee Condition	--	Observation	1/Week	--
Color	--	Observation	1/Week	--
Odor	--	Observation	1/Week	--

¹ Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods requested by the Discharger that have been approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

D. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization

- 2020 Semi-Annual Monitoring.** Semi-annual samples shall be collected from the effluent and upstream receiving water (Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table E-10, below. Semi-annual monitoring shall be conducted during the year 2020 (two samples throughout the year during periods of discharge to the Sacramento River) and the results of such monitoring shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the monthly SMR's. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.
- Concurrent Sampling.** Effluent and receiving water sampling shall be performed at approximately the same time, on the same date.
- Sample Type.** All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples. Effluent samples shall be taken as described in Table E-10, below.
- Analytical Methods Report.** The Discharger shall submit a report electronically via CIWQS submittal outlining reporting levels (RL's), method detection limits (MDL's), and analytical methods for the constituents listed in tables E-2, E-3, E-5, E-6, E-7, E-8, E-9, and E-10, by the due date shown in the Technical Reports Table E-12. The Discharger shall comply with the monitoring and reporting requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the SIP. The maximum required reporting levels for priority pollutant constituents shall be based on the Minimum Levels (ML's) contained in Appendix 4 of the SIP, determined in accordance with Section 2.4.2 and Section 2.4.3 of the SIP. In accordance with Section 2.4.2 of the SIP, when there is more than one ML value for a given substance, the Central Valley Water Board shall include as RL's, in the permit, all ML values, and their associated analytical methods, listed in Appendix 4 that are below the calculated effluent limitation. The Discharger may select any one of those cited analytical methods for compliance determination. If no ML value is below the effluent limitation, then the Central Valley Water Board shall select as the RL, the lowest ML value, and its associated analytical method, listed in Appendix 4 for inclusion in the permit. **Table E-10** below provides required maximum reporting levels in accordance with the SIP.

Table E-10. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
2-Chloroethyl vinyl ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Acrolein	µg/L	Grab	2

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Bromoform	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroform	µg/L	Grab	2
Chloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Dichlorobromomethane ²	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Dichloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	1
Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)	µg/L	Grab	1
Naphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
Tetrachloroethene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Toluene	µg/L	Grab	2
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	1
Trichloroethene	µg/L	Grab	2
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	µg/L	Grab	--
Trichlorofluoromethane	µg/L	Grab	--
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2- Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichloropropane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichloropropylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2- Trifluoroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
1,2-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,4-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-Benzanthracene	µg/L	Grab	5
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	Grab	1
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	Grab	2
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
3,4-Benzofluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	5
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	5
Acenaphthene	µg/L	Grab	1
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	Grab	10
Anthracene	µg/L	Grab	10
Benzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	2
Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	µg/L	Grab	5
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	10
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate ³	µg/L	Grab	5
Butyl benzyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Chrysene	µg/L	Grab	5
Di-n-butylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Di-n-octylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene	µg/L	Grab	0.1
Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluorene	µg/L	Grab	10
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	Grab	5
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	µg/L	Grab	0.05
Isophorone	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	Grab	10
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Phenanthrene	µg/L	Grab	5
Phenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Pyrene	µg/L	Grab	10
Aluminum	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Antimony	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	5
Arsenic	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	10
Asbestos	MFL	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Beryllium	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	2
Cadmium	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
Chromium (Total)	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	50
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	10
Copper ²	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	25
Cyanide	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	5

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
Fluoride	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Iron	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Lead	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
Mercury	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Manganese	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Nickel	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	20
Selenium	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	5
Silver	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.25
Thallium	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	1
Tributyltin	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Zinc ²	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	20
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.05
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.05
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.02
alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
Aldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.005
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.005
Chlordane	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.1
delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.005
Dieldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
Endosulfan sulfate	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
Endrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
Heptachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.01
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.02
Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
PCB-1016	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
PCB-1221	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
PCB-1232	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
PCB-1242	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
PCB-1248	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
PCB-1254	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
PCB-1260	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	0.5
Toxaphene	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Ammonia (as N) ²	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Boron	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Chloride	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Flow ²	MGD	Meter	--
Hardness (as CaCO ₃) ²	mg/L	Grab	--
Foaming Agents (MBAS)	µg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Mercury, Methyl	ng/L	Grab	--
Nitrate (as N) ²	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Nitrite (as N) ²	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
pH ²	Std Units	Grab	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level ¹
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Specific conductance (EC) ²	µmhos/cm	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Sulfate	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Sulfide (as S)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Sulfite (as SO ₃)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--
Temperature ²	°C	Grab	--
Total Dissolved Solids ²	mg/L	24-hr Composite ⁴	--

¹ The reporting levels required in this table for priority pollutant constituents are established based on section 2.4.2 and Appendix 4 of the SIP.

² The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent monitoring or receiving water monitoring for constituents that have already been sampled in a given month, as required in Table E-3 and Table E-6, except for hardness, pH, and temperature, which shall be conducted concurrently with the effluent and receiving water sampling.

³ In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.

⁴ 24-hour flow proportional composite.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.
2. Upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a summary monitoring report. The report shall contain both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year(s).
3. **Compliance Time Schedules.** For compliance time schedules included in the Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board, on or before each compliance due date, the specified document or a written report detailing compliance or non-compliance with the specific date and task. If non-compliance is reported, the Discharger shall state the reasons for non-compliance and include an estimate of the date when the Discharger will be in compliance. The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.
4. The Discharger shall report to the Central Valley Water Board any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission within 15 days of reporting the data to the Commission pursuant to section 313 of the "Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act" of 1986.

B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMR's)

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit SMR's using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program website http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/. The CIWQS website will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.
2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit monthly SMR's including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMR's are to include all new monitoring results obtained

since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR. Monthly SMR's are required even if there is no discharge. If no discharge occurs during the month, the monitoring report must be submitted stating that there has been no discharge.

3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

Table E-11. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Day	Permit effective date	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	Submit with monthly SMR
3/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
2/Month	Permit effective date	1 st day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
1/Month	Permit effective date	1 st day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
1/Quarter	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 March 1 April through 30 June 1 July through 30 September 1 October through 31 December	1 May 1 August 1 November 1 February of following year
2/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 30 June 1 July through 31 December	1 August 1 February of following year
1/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 December	1 February of following year

4. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable RL and the current laboratory's Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136.

The Discharger shall report the results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample using the following reporting protocols:

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

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

- c. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected," or ND.
 - d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that ML value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
5. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL), average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL), or maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for priority pollutants and more than one sample result is available, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the Discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
- a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
 - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
6. The Discharger shall submit SMR's in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the Facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.
 - b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the waste discharge requirements (WDR's); discuss 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.
 - c. The Discharger shall attach all laboratory analysis sheets, including quality assurance/quality control information, with all SMR's for which sample analyses were performed. This requirement applies to samples analyzed pursuant to this MRP, section I.F. Providing final laboratory reports, or equivalent, for chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses, conducted by a laboratory accredited by DDW, that reports the Discharger's sample result(s) and results of quality

assurance/quality control analyses applicable to the samples tested, can be used to fully satisfy this requirement.

7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMR's calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:

- a. **Mass Loading Limitations.** For ammonia, the Discharger shall calculate and report the mass loading (lbs/day) in the SMR's. The mass loading shall be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass Loading (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34$$

For weekly average mass loading, the weekly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For monthly average mass loading, the monthly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used.

- b. **Removal Efficiency (BOD₅ and TSS).** The Discharger shall calculate and report the percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS in the SMR's. The percent removal shall be calculated as specified in section VII.A of the Waste Discharge Requirements.
- c. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the 7-day median of total coliform organisms for the effluent. The 7-day median of total coliform organisms shall be calculated as specified in section VII.C of the Waste Discharge Requirements.
- d. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall report monthly in the SMR the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the receiving water (Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002).
- e. **Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the turbidity change in the receiving waters applicable to the natural turbidity conditions specified in section V.A.17.a-e. of the Waste Discharge Requirements.
- f. **Temperature Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the temperature change in the receiving water based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.

C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's)

DMR's are U.S. EPA reporting requirements. The Discharger shall electronically certify and submit DMR's together with SMR's using Electronic Self-Monitoring Reports module eSMR 2.5 or any upgraded version. Electronic DMR submittal will be in addition to electronic SMR submittal. Information about electronic DMR submittal is available at the DMR website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/discharge_monitoring/.

D. Other Reports

1. **Annual Operations Report.** The Discharger shall submit a written report to the Central Valley Water Board by the due date in the Technical Reports Table E-12. The Annual Operations Report shall be submitted electronically via CIWQS submittal and contain the following:
- a. The names, certificate grades, and general responsibilities of all persons employed at the Facility.
- b. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the plant for emergency and routine situations.

- c. A statement certifying when the flow meter(s) and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration.
 - d. A statement certifying whether the current operation and maintenance manual and contingency plan reflect the Facility as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when these documents were last revised and last reviewed for adequacy.
 - e. The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the Central Valley Water Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing. The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the WDR's.
2. **Technical Report Submittals.** This Order includes requirements to submit a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD), special study technical reports, progress reports, and other reports identified in the MRP (hereafter referred to collectively as "technical reports"). The Technical Reports Table below summarizes all technical reports required by this Order and the due dates for submittal. All technical reports shall be submitted electronically via CIWQS submittal. Technical reports should be uploaded as a PDF, Microsoft Word, or Microsoft Excel file attachment.

Table E-12. Technical Reports

Report #	Technical Report	Due Date	CIWQS Report Name
Standard Reporting Requirements			
1	Report of Waste Discharge	31 January 2023	ROWD
2	Report outlining reporting levels (RLs), method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval	5 February 2019	MRP IX.D.4
3	Annual Operations Report	31 January 2020	MRP X.D.1
4		31 January 2021	MRP X.D.1
5		31 January 2022	MRP X.D.1
6		31 January 2023	MRP X.D.1
7		31 January 2024	MRP X.D.1
Other Reports			
8	Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan Summary	31 January 2023 if required ¹	WDR VI.C.3.a

¹ This report is only required if the annual average calendar year effluent EC concentration exceeds 700 µmhos/cm. If required, the report shall consist of a summary of the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan according to WDR section VI.C.3.a.

F.

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Contents

I.	Permit Information.....	F-3
II.	Facility Description.....	F-4
	A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls.....	F-4
	B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters	F-5
	C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data	F-6
	D. Compliance Summary	F-7
	E. Planned Changes	F-7
III.	Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations	F-8
	A. Legal Authorities.....	F-8
	B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).....	F-8
	C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans	F-8
	D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List.....	F-11
	E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations	F-11
IV.	Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-12
	A. Discharge Prohibitions.....	F-13
	B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations	F-13
	1. Scope and Authority	F-13
	2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations	F-14
	C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's)	F-15
	1. Scope and Authority	F-15
	2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives.....	F-15
	3. Determining the Need for WQBEL's.....	F-34
	4. WQBEL Calculations.....	F-49
	5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)	F-51
	D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations	F-53
	1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations	F-53
	2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations	F-53
	3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.....	F-53
	4. Antidegradation Policies.....	F-55
	5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.....	F-60
	E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable	F-62
	F. Land Discharge Specifications	F-62
	G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-62
V.	Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations	F-62
	A. Surface Water.....	F-62
	B. Groundwater.....	F-62
VI.	Rationale for Provisions	F-63
	A. Standard Provisions.....	F-63
	B. Special Provisions	F-63
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	F-63
	2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-64
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention	F-66
	4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications.....	F-66
	5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW's)	F-66
	6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable.....	F-67
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable	F-67

VII.	Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	F-67
A.	Influent Monitoring	F-67
B.	Effluent Monitoring	F-67
C.	Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing Requirements.....	F-68
D.	Receiving Water Monitoring.....	F-69
	1. Surface Water	F-69
	2. Groundwater	F-69
E.	Other Monitoring Requirements.....	F-70
VIII.	Public Participation	F-71
A.	Notification of Interested Persons.....	F-72
B.	Written Comments	F-72
C.	Public Hearing	F-72
D.	Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements	F-72
E.	Information and Copying.....	F-73
F.	Register of Interested Persons	F-73
G.	Additional Information	F-73

Tables

Table F-1.	Facility Information	F-3
Table F-2.	Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Point 001	F-6
Table F-3.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses.....	F-9
Table F-4.	Summary of Technology-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-14
Table F-5.	Critical Receiving Water Flows.....	F-18
Table F-6.	Effluent and Receiving Water Flows for Calculating Dilution Ratios	F-19
Table F-7.	Calculated Dilution Ratios	F-19
Table F-8.	Mixing Zone Study Results.....	F-20
Table F-9.	Dilution Credits Associated with Performance-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-24
Table F-10.	Summary of CTR Criteria and Site-Specific Basin Plan Objectives for Hardness-Dependent Metals.....	F-28
Table F-11.	Verification of CTR Compliance for Nickel	F-32
Table F-12.	Verification of CTR Compliance for Silver	F-32
Table F-13.	Verification of CTR Compliance for Copper	F-33
Table F-14.	Verification of CTR Compliance for Zinc	F-34
Table F-15.	Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives.....	F-35
Table F-16.	Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-51
Table F-17.	Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results.....	F-52
Table F-18.	Summary of Final Effluent Limitations	F-61

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in section II.B of this Order, the Central Valley Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as findings of the Central Valley Water Board supporting the issuance of this Order. This Fact Sheet discusses the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

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

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the Facility.

Table F-1. Facility Information

WDID	5A470101001
CIWQS Facility Place ID	220850
Discharger	City of Dunsmuir
Name of Facility	Wastewater Treatment Plant
Facility Address	1100 South First Street
	Dunsmuir, CA 96025
	Shasta and Siskiyou Counties
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	Ron LaRue, Utilities Supervisor, (530) 235-2325, or Mark Brannigan, City Manager, (530) 235-4822
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	Ron LaRue, Utilities Supervisor, (530) 235-2325
Mailing Address	5915 Dunsmuir Avenue, Dunsmuir, CA 96025
Billing Address	Same as Mailing Address
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)
Major or Minor Facility	Minor
Threat to Water Quality	1
Complexity	B
Pretreatment Program	Not Applicable
Recycling Requirements	Not Applicable
Facility Permitted Flow	0.30 million gallons per day (MGD), average dry weather flow
Facility Design Flow	0.30 MGD, average dry weather flow
Watershed	Upper Sacramento Hydrologic Unit (525.00) Mount Shasta Hydrologic Area (525.20) Dunsmuir Hydrologic Subarea (525.22)
Receiving Water	Sacramento River/Land Discharge to Percolation Ponds
Receiving Water Type	Inland Surface Water/Groundwater

- A. The City of Dunsmuir (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the City of Dunsmuir Wastewater Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a POTW.

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

- B.** The Facility discharges wastewater to the Sacramento River, a water of the United States, or to percolation ponds, within the Upper Sacramento Hydrologic Unit, Mount Shasta Hydrologic Area, and Dunsmuir Hydrologic Subarea. The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2012-0085 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0078441 adopted on 4 October 2012 with an expiration date of 1 November 2017. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.
- C.** When applicable, state law requires dischargers to file a petition with the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Water Rights and receive approval for any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that decreases the flow in any portion of a watercourse. The State Water Board retains separate jurisdictional authority to enforce any applicable requirements under Water Code section 1211. This is not an NPDES permit requirement.
- D.** The Discharger filed a complete report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its waste discharge requirements (WDR's) and NPDES permit on 5 May 2017. A site visit was conducted on 20 December 2017 to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge
- E.** Regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.46 limit the duration of NPDES permits to a fixed term not to exceed 5 years. Accordingly, Table 3 of this Order limits the duration of the discharge authorization. Under 40 C.F.R. section 122.6(d), states authorized to administer the NPDES program may administratively continue state-issued permits beyond their expiration dates until the effective date of the new permits, if state law allows it. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 23, section 2235.4, the terms and conditions of an expired permit are automatically continued pending reissuance of the permit if the Discharger complies with all federal NPDES requirements for continuation of expired permits.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the City of Dunsmuir and adjacent areas, and serves a population of approximately 1,600. The design average dry weather flow capacity of the Facility is 0.30 MGD.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

A Capital Improvement Project (CIP) was developed as part of the Facility's 2007 Master Sewer Plan, with improvement projects considered necessary for the Discharger to continue to operate a wastewater treatment plant capable of meeting water quality standards. Some of these projects have been completed, including the replacement of the comminutor and installation of automated chlorination and dechlorination disinfection equipment. An update to the CIP was completed in a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) submitted in May 2010, with remaining projects being recommended. The Discharger completed a 2013 Wastewater Collection and Treatment Improvement Project (2013 Project), which addressed many of the improvement projects recommended in the 2007 CIP and 2010 PER.

The 2013 Project included the following Facility upgrades:

1. Collection system improvements to address inflow and infiltration (I&I);
2. Upgrades to the grit chamber;
3. Addition of a diffused air system to the oxidation ditch;
4. Conversion of the 35-foot-diameter secondary clarifier to an aerobic digester;
5. Construction of a new 60-foot-diameter clarifier;

6. Construction of a mixed liquor pump station;
7. Addition of a second traveling bridge filter and retrofitting of the existing traveling bridge filter;
8. Installation of new diesel generator;
9. Replacement of outdated electrical equipment;
10. Construction of new lab space;
11. Installation of temperature-controlled composite machines; and
12. Addition of powdered activated carbon and alkalinity dosing machines.

The Facility's current treatment system consists of the headworks, which include an aerated grit chamber, a dimminutor, a Parshall Flume, an oxidation ditch equipped with brush aerators, a secondary clarifier, an aerobic digester, two traveling bridge filters, gas (Cl_2) chlorination, and gas (SO_2) dechlorination.

Advanced-secondary treated effluent is discharged to the Sacramento River through a multiport diffuser. As allowed by this Order, effluent may be discharged to the Sacramento River between 16 September and 14 June. During the summer months, all treated wastewater is discharged to the Facility's five percolation ponds. Effluent discharged to the percolation ponds is subject to secondary treatment standards and is not dechlorinated prior to discharge. While the percolation ponds can be utilized at any time during the year, they were never intended to handle year-round flows due to the impact of winter rains, wintertime groundwater intrusion, and increased flows due to I&I. Additionally, discharge to the percolation ponds outside of the summer period affects the on-site effluent storage volume available for summertime use.

In early 2017, several cold storms provided snow in low elevations followed by warm, heavy rain events, which created flooding conditions in the vicinity of the Facility's diffuser at Discharge Point 001. After the flows receded, the Discharger discovered a large amount of gravel had been deposited to the east side of the river bed, creating a new channel on the west side of the river. Prior to the storm events, the river channel was on the east side, which is where the Facility's diffuser is located. With the new river alignment, the diffusers are exposed during low flow conditions. The Discharger completed the Sacramento River Channel Restoration Project in the fall of 2017 that restored river flow to the east side of the river by establishing a diversion channel through the recently deposited gravel bar upstream of the diffuser. Gravel deposited immediately downstream of the diffuser was dredged to remove debris, prevent clogging of the diffusers, and provide sufficient dilution of the Facility's effluent. The diversion channel upstream of the discharge, in combination with the removal of sediment immediately downstream of the diffuser, restored flow to the east side of the river.

Biosolids produced in the aerobic digester are discharged to two sludge lagoons for storage and further decomposition. During the summer months, three sludge drying beds are used to dry biosolids pumped from the sludge lagoons. Dried biosolids are transported to a paved area located northeast of the Facility for further drying before being hauled to an offsite landfill. The Facility produces approximately 20 dry metric tons of dried biosolids annually. Transportation and disposal/reuse of the biosolids are regulated by U.S. EPA under 40 C.F.R. part 503.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 1, T39N, R4W, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.

2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point 001 to the Sacramento River, a water of the United States, at a point latitude 41° 11' 00.207" N and longitude 122° 17' 00.073" W.
3. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point 002 to five unlined percolation ponds located at the Facility.

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

1. Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2012-0085 for discharges of advanced-secondary treated effluent at Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2012-0085 are as follows:

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data – Discharge Point 001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (September 2014 – June 2017)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Flow	MGD	--	--	0.30 ¹	--	--	1.384 ²
Conventional Pollutants							
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	24.5	41	41
	lbs/day ³	25	38	50	43	53.685	53.685
	% Removal	85	--	--	96.9 ⁴	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	6.5 – 8.0	--	--	6.51 – 7.7
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	9.4	16.8	16.8
	lbs/day ³	25	38	50	18	21.998	21.998
	% Removal	85	--	--	97.7 ⁴	--	--
Priority Pollutants							
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	25.6	--	25.6	20.6	--	20.6
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	4.1	--	4.1	3.75	--	3.75
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	64	--	87	69.8	--	69.8
Non-Conventional Pollutants							
Ammonia, Total (as N)	mg/L	21.9	--	21.9	15.8	--	15.8
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.011 ⁵	0.019 ⁶	--	--	<0.01
Nitrate Plus Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	44.1	--	--	2.03	--	--
Settleable Solids	mL/L	0.1	--	0.2	--	--	<0.1
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL ⁷	--	23 ⁸	240	--	--	300
	MPN/100 mL ⁹	2.2 ⁸	23 ¹⁰	240 ¹¹	--	--	<2.0
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	--	--	70 ¹² /90 ¹³	--	--	95 ¹⁴

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (September 2014 – June 2017)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge

- 1 Applied as an average dry weather flow effluent limitation.
- 2 Represents the maximum observed daily discharge.
- 3 Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.30 MGD.
- 4 Represents the minimum reported percent removal.
- 5 Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.
- 6 Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.
- 7 Effluent limitations applicable for discharges from 16 November through 30 April.
- 8 Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.
- 9 Effluent limitations applicable for discharges from 1 May through 14 June and 16 September through 15 November.
- 10 Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.
- 11 Applied as an instantaneous maximum effluent limitation.
- 12 Minimum percent survival for any one bioassay.
- 13 Median percent survival of three consecutive acute bioassays.
- 14 Represents the minimum observed percent survival.

D. Compliance Summary

The Discharger was not subject to any enforcement actions during the term of Order R5-2012-0085.

E. Planned Changes

The Discharger received planning grants from the State Water Board Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) for collection system and Facility improvements. The collection system CWSRF grant will be used to complete a comprehensive I&I monitoring and reduction study to develop and associated CIP, which will ultimately lead to design and implementation of the proposed improvements. The I&I monitoring study began in the fall of 2017. The Facility improvements grant will evaluate deficiencies at the Facility, such as proper rag removal, automated aeration in the oxidation ditch with variable frequency drives, Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA)/telemetry upgrades, disinfection byproduct concerns, and diffuser location. A PER is expected to be completed in the fall of 2018.

The Discharger is considering the following proposed improvements to the Facility and its associated collection system:

1. Repair of existing collection system deficiencies;
2. Completion of I&I monitoring and implementation of I&I improvements;
3. Installation of automatic screening system for rag removal;
4. Improvements to the anoxic selector to increase weir capacity;
5. Replacement of fixed-speed rotators with variable-speed rotators in the oxidation ditch;
6. Addition of SCADA telemetry;
7. Mitigation of disinfection by-product issues, including the investigation of disinfection system alternatives, such as ultraviolet light (UV);
8. Addition of mechanical dewatering facilities;
9. Addition of online monitoring for dissolved oxygen, nitrate, ammonia, and pH;

10. Investigation of enhanced treatment methods, such as coagulant/polymer addition to improve metals removal; and
11. Improvements to the groundwater monitoring wells, including the installation of new, deeper, properly sealed wells.

The Discharger also plans to evaluate relocating the Facility's diffuser 500 feet south of its current location, where the river bed is at the full channel width throughout the year.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

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

A. Legal Authorities

This Order serves as WDR's pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this Facility to surface waters.

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

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

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

1. **Water Quality Control Plan.** Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans.
 - a. **Basin Plan.** The Central Valley Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fifth Edition* (Revised May 2018), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply (MUN). Beneficial uses applicable to Sacramento River from Box Canyon Dam to Shasta Lake are as follows:

Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Sacramento River	<u>Existing:</u> Agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (AGR); water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); cold spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN); and wildlife habitat (WILD). <u>Potential:</u> Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN).
002	Groundwater	<u>Potential:</u> Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN); agricultural supply (AGR); industrial service supply (IND); and industrial process supply (PRO).

2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000, U.S. EPA adopted the 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 13 February 2001. These rules contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants.
3. **State Implementation Policy.** On 2 March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on 28 April 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the U.S. EPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Central Valley Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on 18 May 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. EPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on 24 February 2005, which became effective on 13 July 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.
4. **Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulation 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution 68-16 ("*Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California*") (State Antidegradation Policy). The State Antidegradation Policy is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. The State Antidegradation Policy requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge must be consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Antidegradation Policy. The Central Valley Water Board finds this Order is consistent with the federal and State Water Board antidegradation regulations and policy.
5. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These

anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.

6. **Domestic Water Quality.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels (MCL's) designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.
7. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.
8. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act.** Section 13263.6(a) of the Water Code requires that *"the Regional Water Board shall prescribe effluent limitations as part of the waste discharge requirements of a POTW for all substances that the most recent toxic chemical release data reported to the state emergency response commission pursuant to section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. sec. 11023) (EPCRA) indicate as discharged into the POTW, for which the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board has established numeric water quality objectives, and has determined that the discharge is or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to, an excursion above any numeric water quality objective"*.

The most recent toxic chemical data report does not indicate any reportable off-site releases or discharges to the collection system for this Facility. Therefore, a reasonable potential analysis (RPA) based on information from EPCRA cannot be conducted. Based on information from EPCRA, there is no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above any numeric water quality objectives included within the Basin Plan or in any State Water Board plan, so no effluent limitations are included in this permit pursuant to Water Code section 13263.6(a).

However, as detailed elsewhere in this Order, available effluent data indicate that there are constituents present in the effluent that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality standards and require inclusion of effluent limitations based on federal and state laws and regulations.

9. **Storm Water Requirements.** U.S. EPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 C.F.R. parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The State Water Board does not require wastewater treatment facilities with design flows less than 1 MGD to obtain coverage under Water Quality Order 2014-0057-DWQ, General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001). Therefore, this Order does not regulate storm water.

10. **Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems.**

The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on 2 May 2006. The State Water Board amended the MRP for the General Order through Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC on 6 August 2013. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than 1 mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMP's) and report all sanitary sewer overflows (SSO's), among other requirements and prohibitions.

The Discharger is subject to the requirements of, and must comply with, State Water Board Order 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, as amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC and any subsequent order.

D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 CWA, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments (WQLS's). The waters on these lists do not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 6 April 2018, U.S. EPA gave final approval to California's 2014 and 2016 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. The Basin Plan references this list of WQLS's, which are defined as "...those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 C.F.R. part 130, et seq.)." The Basin Plan also states, "Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLS's]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment." The Sacramento River from Box Canyon to Shasta Lake is not listed as an impaired water body on the 2014 and 2016 303(d) list.
2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL's).** At the time of this permit renewal, there are no approved TMDL's with waste load allocations (WLA's) that apply to this Facility.
3. The 303(d) listings and TMDL's have been considered in the development of the Order. A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation of each pollutant of concern is described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations

1. **Title 27.** The discharge authorized herein and the treatment and storage facilities associated with the discharge of treated municipal wastewater, except for discharges of residual sludge and solid waste, are exempt from the requirements of Title 27, CCR, section 20005 *et seq* (hereafter Title 27). The exemption, pursuant to Title 27, CCR, section 20090(a), is based on the following:
 - a. The waste consists primarily of domestic sewage and treated effluent;
 - b. The waste discharge requirements are consistent with water quality objectives; and
 - c. The treatment and storage facilities described herein are associated with a municipal wastewater treatment plant.

IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

Effluent limitations and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to sections 301 (Effluent Limitations), 302 (Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations), 304 (Information and Guidelines), and 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards) of the CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The CWA mandates the implementation of effluent limitations that are as stringent as necessary to meet water quality standards established pursuant to state or federal law [33 U.S.C., § 1311(b)(1)(C); 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)]. NPDES permits must incorporate discharge limits necessary to ensure that water quality standards are met. This requirement applies to narrative criteria as well as to criteria specifying maximum amounts of particular pollutants. Pursuant to federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that “*are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality.*” Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vi), further provide that “[w]here a state has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in an effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits.”

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBEL's) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where numeric water quality objectives have not been established. The Basin Plan at page IV-17.00 contains an implementation policy, “*Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*,” which specifies that the Central Valley Water Board “*will, on a case-by-case basis, adopt numerical limitations in orders which will implement the narrative objectives.*” This policy complies with 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1). With respect to narrative objectives, the Central Valley Water Board must establish effluent limitations using one or more of three specified sources, including: (1) U.S. EPA's published water quality criteria, (2) a proposed state criterion (i.e., water quality objective) or an explicit state policy interpreting its narrative water quality criteria (i.e., the Central Valley Water Board's “*Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*”)(40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(A), (B) or (C)), or (3) an indicator parameter.

The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, discoloration, radionuclides, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at III-8.00) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, “*...water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCL's)*” in Title 22 of CCR. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Central Valley Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCL's. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: “*Water shall not contain taste- or odor-*

producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses."

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. **Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.
2. **Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of untreated wastewater, except under the conditions at 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4)).** As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the Facility. Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), define "bypass" as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Water Board's prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Board adopted a precedential decision, Order WQO 2002-0015, which cites the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.
3. **Prohibition III.C (No controllable condition shall create a nuisance).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13050 that requires water quality objectives be established for the prevention of nuisance within a specific area. The Basin Plan prohibits conditions that create a nuisance.
4. **Prohibition III.D (No discharge of hazardous waste).** This prohibition is based on CCR, Title 22, section 66261.1 et seq. that prohibits discharge of hazardous waste.
5. **Prohibition III.E (The discharge of advanced-secondary treated wastewater to the Sacramento River at Discharge Point 001 between 15 June and 15 September is prohibited).** The Discharger is prohibited from discharging to the Sacramento River at Discharge Point 001 during the recreation season (15 June through 15 September). This prohibition is retained from Order R5-2012-0085.
6. **Prohibition III.F (Average Dry Weather Flow).** This prohibition is based on the design average dry weather flow treatment capacity rating for the Facility and ensures the Facility is operated within its treatment capacity. Previous Order R5-2012-0085 included flow as an effluent limit based on the Facility design flow. Flow is not a pollutant and therefore has been changed from an effluent limit to a discharge prohibition in this Order, which is an equivalent level of regulation. This Order is not less stringent because compliance with flow as a discharge prohibition will be calculated the same way as the previous Order.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing U.S. EPA permit regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements, at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at 40 C.F.R. part 133.

Regulations promulgated in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3(a)(1) require technology-based effluent limitations for municipal dischargers to be placed in NPDES permits based on Secondary Treatment Standards or Equivalent to Secondary Treatment Standards.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) established the minimum performance requirements for POTW's [defined in section 304(d)(1)]. Section 301(b)(1)(B) of that Act requires that such treatment works must, as a minimum, meet effluent limitations based on secondary treatment as defined by the U.S. EPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, U.S. EPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 C.F.R. part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

- a. **BOD₅ and TSS.** Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 133 establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD₅ and TSS. In addition, 40 C.F.R. section 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS over each calendar month. This Order requires WQBEL's that are equal to or more stringent than the secondary technology-based treatment described in 40 C.F.R. part 133 (see section IV.C.3.c of the Fact Sheet for a discussion on pathogens, which includes WQBEL's for BOD₅ and TSS).
- b. **pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units. This Order, however, requires more stringent WQBEL's for pH to comply with the Basin Plan's water quality objectives for pH.

Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations Discharge Point 001

Table F-4. Summary of Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30 ¹	45 ¹	--	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0 ¹	9.0 ¹
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30 ¹	45 ¹	--	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--

¹ More stringent WQBEL's are applicable to the discharge and are included in this Order, as described further in section IV.C.3.c of this Fact Sheet.

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's)

1. Scope and Authority

CWA section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as technology equivalence requirements, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) of 40 C.F.R. requires that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBEL's must be established using: (1) U.S. EPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting the state's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBEL's when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water, as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in other state plans and policies, or any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

Finally, 40 C.F.R. section 122(d)(1)(vii) requires effluent limits to be developed consistent with any available WLA's developed and approved for the discharge.

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for MUN.

The Basin Plan on page II-1.00 states: "*Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning...*" and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that "*...disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the state; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses.*"

The federal CWA section 101(a)(2) states: "*it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1, 1983.*" Federal regulations, developed to implement the requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the state be regulated to protect the beneficial uses of public water supply, protection and propagation of fish, shell fish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation.

40 C.F.R. section 131.3(e) defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after 28 November 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal regulation, 40 C.F.R. section 131.10, requires that uses be obtained by implementing effluent limitations, requires that all downstream uses be protected, and states that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a beneficial use for any waters of the United States.

- a. **Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.** Refer to section III.C.1, above, for a complete description of the receiving water and beneficial uses.
- b. **Effluent and Ambient Background Data.** The RPA, as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data collected during the permitted discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMR's and the ROWD. Effluent monitoring data for discharges at both Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and Discharge Point 002 (Monitoring Location LND-00A) was used for the RPA.
- c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone**

- i. **Regulatory Guidance for Dilution Credits and Mixing Zones.** The CWA directs states to adopt water quality standards to protect the quality of their waters. U.S. EPA's current water quality standards regulation authorizes states to adopt general policies, such as mixing zones, to implement state water quality standards (40 C.F.R. sections 122.44 and 122.45). U.S. EPA allows states to have broad flexibility in designing mixing zone policies. Primary policy and guidance on determining mixing zones and dilution credits is provided by the SIP and the Basin Plan. If no procedure applies in the SIP or the Basin Plan, then the Central Valley Water Board may use the U.S. EPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control* (EPA/505/2-90-001) (TSD).

For non-priority pollutant constituents, the allowance of mixing zones by the Central Valley Water Board is discussed in the Basin Plan, *Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*, which states in part, "In conjunction with the issuance of NPDES and storm water permits, the Regional Board may designate mixing zones within which water quality objectives will not apply provided the discharger has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Board that the mixing zone will not adversely impact beneficial uses. If allowed, different mixing zones may be designated for different types of objectives, including, but not limited to, acute aquatic life objectives, chronic aquatic life objectives, human health objectives, and acute and chronic whole effluent toxicity objectives, depending in part on the averaging period over which the objectives apply. In determining the size of such mixing zones, the Regional Board will consider the applicable procedures and guidelines in the EPA's *Water Quality Standards Handbook* and the [TSD]. Pursuant to EPA guidelines, mixing zones designated for acute aquatic life objectives will generally be limited to a small zone of initial dilution in the immediate vicinity of the discharge."

For priority pollutants, the SIP supersedes the Basin Plan mixing zone provisions. Section 1.4.2 of the SIP states, in part, "...with the exception of effluent limitations derived from TMDL's, in establishing and determining compliance with effluent limitations for applicable human health, acute aquatic life, or chronic aquatic life priority pollutant criteria/objectives or the toxicity objective for aquatic life protection in a basin plan, the Regional Board may

*grant mixing zones and dilution credits to dischargers... The applicable priority pollutant criteria and objectives are to be met through a water body except within any mixing zone granted by the Regional Board. **The allowance of mixing zones is discretionary and shall be determined on a discharge-by-discharge basis.** The Regional Board may consider allowing mixing zones and dilution credits only for discharges with a physically identifiable point of discharge that is regulated through an NPDES permit issued by the Regional Board.” [emphasis added]*

For incompletely-mixed discharges, the Discharger must complete an independent mixing zone study to demonstrate to the Central Valley Water Board that a dilution credit is appropriate. In granting a mixing zone, section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires the following to be met:

“A mixing zone shall be as small as practicable. The following conditions must be met in allowing a mixing zone: [emphasis added]

A: A mixing zone shall not:

1. compromise the integrity of the entire water body;
2. cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone;
3. restrict the passage of aquatic life;
4. adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or state endangered species laws;
5. produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life;
6. result in floating debris, oil, or scum;
7. produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity;
8. cause objectionable bottom deposits;
9. cause nuisance;
10. dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls; or
11. be allowed at or near any drinking water intake. A mixing zone is not a source of drinking water. To the extent of any conflict between this determination and the Sources of Drinking Water Policy (Resolution 88-63), this SIP supersedes the provisions of that policy.”

Section 1.4.2.1 of the SIP establishes the authority for the Central Valley Water Board to consider dilution credits based on the mixing zone conditions in a receiving water. Section 1.4.2.1 in part states:

*“The dilution credit, D, is a numerical value associated with the mixing zone that accounts for the receiving water entrained into the discharge. The dilution credit is a value used in the calculation of effluent limitations (described in section 1.4). **Dilution credits may be limited or denied on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis, which may result in a dilution credit for all, some, or no priority pollutants in the discharge.**” [emphasis added]*

The mixing zone is thus an administrative construct defined as an area around the outfall that may exceed water quality objectives, but is otherwise protective

of the beneficial uses. Dilution is defined as the amount of mixing that has occurred at the edge of this mixing zone under critical conditions, thus protecting the beneficial uses at the concentration and for the duration and frequency required.

- ii. **Sacramento River Hydrology.** The upper Sacramento River in the vicinity of the discharge has sufficient flows for dilution (greater than 20:1). The discharge location is 10 miles downstream of Box Canyon Dam and approximately 30 miles upstream of Shasta Lake. Shasta Dam, Box Canyon Dam, and the reservoirs created by them are the most prominent water supply/flood control features present in the watershed. The Sacramento River watershed upstream from Shasta Lake has an area of about 6,420 square miles. Approximately 50 percent of the watershed is located above 3,000 feet and, as a result, snowfall and snowpack are major influences on the hydrologic cycle of the area. Lake Siskiyou (created by Box Canyon Dam in 1968 for purposes of hydroelectric power production) is a 430-acre reservoir with source water derived primarily from snowmelt. Recreation is a primary use of Lake Siskiyou and lake levels are maintained at or near full year-round. However, Siskiyou County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (owner and operator of Box Canyon Dam) is mandated to maintain a minimum outflow discharge rate of 40 cubic feet per second (cfs) from Box Canyon Dam. There are stream tributaries adding flow between Box Canyon Dam and the Facility outfall and no in-stream continuous recording flow measurement devices exist between Box Canyon Dam and Discharge Point 001.

With the ROWD, the Discharger submitted an update to their September 2009 Mixing Zone Study (2009 Mixing Zone Study), which determined updated critical receiving water flow values at Discharge Point 001 based on the ratio of historical flow values at U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) station 11342000 (Delta Station), located a few miles upstream of Shasta Lake, and the flow measured at Discharge Point 001 on the day of the Discharger's 2009 Mixing Zone Study. The estimated lowest 1-day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in 10 years (1Q10), lowest average 7 consecutive day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in 10 years (7Q10), and harmonic mean flow of the receiving water at Discharge Point 001 are provided in Table F-5, below.

Table F-5. Critical Receiving Water Flows

Critical Low Flows (cfs)	Box Canyon Dam (cfs) (10 miles upstream)	Dunsmuir (cfs) (Facility Outfall)	Delta Flows (cfs) (30 miles downstream)
1Q10	41	79.9	154
7Q10	41	81.5	157
Harmonic Mean	256	216.6	417

The Facility does not discharge to the Sacramento River during the summer, which Order R5-2012-0085 refers to as the "recreation season" and defines as the period from 15 June through 15 September. Therefore, effluent is only discharged to the Sacramento River between 16 September and 14 June.

- iii. **Dilution Ratios.** Before establishing a mixing zone and a dilution credit for a discharge, it must first be determined if and how much (if any), receiving water is available to dilute the discharge. In determining the appropriate available receiving water flow, the Central Valley Water Board may take into account

actual and seasonal variations of the receiving water and the effluent. For example, the Central Valley Water Board may prohibit mixing zones during seasonal low flows and allow them during seasonal high flows. However, for year-round mixing zones, the mixing zone and associated dilution credits shall be determined using the parameters specified in Table F-6, below.

Table F-6. Effluent and Receiving Water Flows for Calculating Dilution Ratios

In calculating dilution ratio for:	Use the critical receiving water flow of:	Use the discharged effluent flow of:
Acute aquatic life criteria/objective	1Q10	Maximum daily flow during period of discharge
Chronic aquatic life criteria/objective	7Q10	Four-day average of daily maximum flows during period of discharge
Human health criteria/objective	Harmonic Mean	Long-term average during period of discharge

For completely-mixed discharges, the amount of receiving water available to dilute the effluent may be determined by calculating the dilution ratio using the flows in Table F-6, above. The Central Valley Water Board cannot grant a dilution credit that is greater than the calculated dilution ratio. Site-specific conditions concerning the discharge and the receiving water may also justify a smaller dilution credit for completely-mixed discharges. For incompletely-mixed discharges, dilution credits and mixing zones may be considered by the Central Valley Water Board only after the Discharger has completed an independent mixing zone study and demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Central Valley Water Board that a dilution credit is appropriate. Dilution credits for incompletely-mixed discharges, inherently, cannot be greater than the calculated dilution ratios from the flow values in Table F-6.

Table F-7, below, provides the calculated dilution ratios for the applicable acute, chronic, and human health criteria/objectives based on the updated critical flow values provided in the ROWD.

Table F-7. Calculated Dilution Ratios

Criteria	Receiving Water (cfs)	Effluent (MGD)	Dilution Ratio
Acute	79.9	2.38	34:1
Chronic	81.5	1.66	49:1
Human Health	216.6	0.327	662:1

The Central Valley Water Board cannot grant a dilution credit that is greater than the calculated dilution ratio. Therefore, based on the data summarized in Table F-7, dilution credits for acute aquatic life, chronic aquatic life, and human health criteria cannot be larger than 34:1, 49:1, and 662:1, respectively. These dilution ratios represent allocating the entire assimilative capacity of the localized river segment.

- iv. **Mixing Zone Study Results.** The Discharger's 2009 Mixing Zone Study included a tracer-dye study with in-stream monitoring to characterize the extent of the actual dilution. The 2009 Mixing Zone Study was conducted while the receiving water flow was approximately 98 cfs and the effluent flow was approximately 0.2 MGD. Field-obtained dilution credits were adjusted linearly to account for the critical flow regimes as outlined in Table F-7, above.

The 2009 Mixing Zone Study found that the discharge is not a completely-mixed discharge. The furthest downstream transect where measurements were taken was 400 feet. At 400 feet downstream of the discharge, the 2009 Mixing Zone Study found that the discharge was not completely-mixed. Calculated dilution credits, as presented in the 2009 Mixing Zone Study Addendum No. 1 at the 20-, 50-, and 100-foot transects and adjusted based on the updated critical flow values calculated in the ROWD, are provided in Table F-8, below. Each transect provides the corresponding dilution credits for each specific criterion (acute aquatic life, chronic aquatic life, and human health). A comparison to maximum allowable dilution (as provided in Table F-7) in the river segment is also provided.

Table F-8. Mixing Zone Study Results

Acute			
Length (ft.)	Width (ft.)	Dilution Credit	Maximum “Available” Dilution Ratio
20	8	6	34:1
50	17	9	
100	19	12	
Chronic			
Length (ft.)	Width (ft.)	Dilution Credit	Maximum “Available” Dilution Ratio
20	8	10	49:1
50	17	14	
100	19	19	
Human Health			
Length (ft.)	Width (ft.)	Dilution Credit	Maximum “Available” Dilution Ratio
20	8	134	662:1
50	17	189	
100	19	252	

The Discharger also performed a biological assessment of the mixing zone and submitted the findings (*Biological Assessment of the City of Dunsmuir Wastewater Treatment Plant Mixing Zone*, November 2009) to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW; formerly the Department of Fish and Game) for review and comment. DFW found the biological assessment to be adequate for trustee purposes.

As described in section II.A of this Fact Sheet, in early 2017, several cold storms provided snow in low elevations followed by warm, heavy rain events, which created flooding conditions in the vicinity of the Facility's diffuser, deposited a large amount of gravel on the east side of the river bed, and created a new channel on the west side of the river. The Discharger completed a project to restore a portion of the flow to the east side of the river by establishing a diversion channel through the recently deposited gravel bar upstream of the diffuser. Gravel deposited immediately downstream of the diffuser was also dredged to provide sufficient dilution of the Facility's effluent. The diversion channel upstream of the discharge, in combination with the replacement of sediment immediately downstream of the diffuser, are expected

to ensure the available dilution of the effluent, as determined in the 2009 Mixing Zone Study and updated as part of the Discharger's ROWD.

v. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Acute and Chronic Aquatic Life**

Criteria. U.S. EPA Region VIII, in its *"EPA Region VIII Mixing Zones and Dilution Policy"*, recommends no dilution for acute aquatic life criteria, stating the following, *"In incomplete mix situations, discharge limitations to implement acute chemical-specific aquatic life criteria and narrative (no acute toxicity) criteria shall be based on achieving such acute criteria at the end-of-pipe (i.e., without an allowance for dilution). This approach is intended to implement the narrative requirement prohibiting acutely toxic conditions in the mixing zone."*

The Discharger has requested acute and chronic aquatic life mixing zones for compliance with acute and chronic water quality criteria for ammonia, copper, and zinc. Acute and chronic aquatic life mixing zones 17 feet wide and extending 50 feet downstream of the Facility's outfall meet the requirements of the SIP as follows:

- (a) *Shall not compromise the integrity of the entire water body* – The TSD states that, *"If the total area affected by elevated concentrations within all mixing zones combined is small compared to the total area of a water body (such as a river segment), then mixing zones are likely to have little effect on the integrity of the water body as a whole, provided that the mixing zone does not impinge on unique or critical habitats."*¹ The width of the Sacramento River at the outfall is approximately 45 feet at the surface. The acute and chronic aquatic life mixing zones are 17 feet wide by 50 feet in length. The mixing zones are small and make up less than half of the stream width. The aquatic life mixing zones do not compromise the integrity of the entire water body.
- (b) *Shall not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone* – The SIP requires that the acute mixing zone be appropriately sized to prevent lethality to organisms passing through the mixing zone. U.S. EPA recommends that float times through a mixing zone less than 15 minutes ensure that there will not be lethality to passing organisms. The acute mixing zone extends 50 feet downstream of the outfall. Based on a minimum river velocity of 1.0 feet/second, the minimum float time is 0.8 minutes.² Furthermore, this Order includes an acute toxicity effluent limitation that requires compliance to be determined based on acute bioassays using 100 percent effluent. Compliance with these requirements ensures that acute toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the acute and chronic mixing zones do not occur.
- (c) *Shall not restrict the passage of aquatic life* – The Discharger conducted a dye test as part of the 2009 Mixing Zone Study, which demonstrated there is a zone of passage for aquatic life. The size of the zone of passage varies on either side of the river depending on the river geometry. The width of the river ranges from approximately 45 to 60 feet. Based on the maximum dye concentration contours, the zone of passage at the surface of the river is approximately 15 feet on the west side of the river and 5 feet on the east side of the river.

¹ TSD, pg. 33

² Mixing Zone and Dilution Study, PACE Engineering dated October 2009.

- (d) *Shall not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or state endangered species laws* – The acute and chronic mixing zones will not cause acutely toxic conditions, allow adequate zones of passage, and are sized appropriately to ensure that there will be no adverse impacts to biologically sensitive or critical habitats.
- (e) *Shall not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life; result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; cause nuisance* – The current discharge has not been shown to result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; or cause nuisance.
- (f) *Shall not dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls* – The acute and chronic mixing zones are small relative to the water body, so they will not dominate the water body. Furthermore, the mixing zones do not overlap mixing zones from other outfalls. There are no outfalls or mixing zones in the vicinity of the discharge (the Mt. Shasta Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) outfall is located approximately 9 miles upstream).
- (g) *Shall not be allowed at or near any drinking water intake* – The acute and chronic mixing zones are not near a drinking water intake. There are no known downstream drinking water intakes between the discharge and Shasta Lake, which is 30 miles downstream.

The acute and chronic aquatic life mixing zones, therefore, comply with the SIP. The mixing zones also comply with the Basin Plan, which requires that the mixing zones not adversely impact beneficial uses. Beneficial uses will not be adversely affected for the same reasons discussed above. In determining the size of the mixing zones, the Central Valley Water Board considered the procedures and guidelines in U.S. EPA's *Water Quality Standards Handbook, 2nd Edition* (updated July 2007), section 5.1, and section 2.2.2 of the TSD. The SIP incorporates the same guidelines.

- vi. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Human Health Criteria.** Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP provides that mixing zones should not be allowed at or near drinking water intakes. Furthermore, regarding the application of a mixing zone for the protection of human health, the TSD states that, "...the presence of mixing zones should not result in significant health risks, when evaluated using reasonable assumptions about exposure pathways. Thus, where drinking water contaminants are a concern, mixing zones should not encroach on drinking water intakes." There are no drinking water intakes in the human health mixing zone. A mixing zone for human health carcinogens has been allowed in this Order for the development of WQBEL's for dichlorobromomethane. The human health mixing zone, which is 8 feet wide and extends 20 feet downstream of the Facility's outfall, meets the requirements of the SIP as follows:

- (a) *Shall not compromise the integrity of the entire water body* – The TSD states that, "If the total area affected by elevated concentrations within all mixing zones combined is small compared to the total area of a water body (such as a river segment), then mixing zones are likely to have little effect on the integrity of the water body as a whole, provided that the

mixing zone does not impinge on unique or critical habitats.”¹ The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. The human health mixing zone does not compromise the integrity of the entire waterbody.

- (b) *Shall not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone* – The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. Therefore, acutely toxic conditions will not occur in the mixing zone.
- (c) *Shall not restrict the passage of aquatic life* – The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. Therefore, the mixing zone will not restrict the passage of aquatic life.
- (d) *Shall not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or state endangered species laws* – The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. The mixing zone will not impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats.
- (e) *Shall not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life; result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; cause nuisance* – The allowance of a human health mixing zone will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; or cause nuisance.
- (f) *Shall not dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls* – The human health mixing zone is small relative to the water body, so it will not dominate the water body. Furthermore, the mixing zone does not overlap mixing zones from other outfalls. There are no outfalls or mixing zones in the vicinity of the discharge (the Mt. Shasta WWTP outfall is located approximately 9 miles upstream).
- (g) *Shall not be allowed at or near any drinking water intake* – The human health mixing zone is not near a drinking water intake. There are no known downstream drinking water intakes between the discharge and Shasta Lake, which is 30 miles downstream.

The human health mixing zone, therefore, complies with the SIP. The mixing zone also complies with the Basin Plan, which requires that the mixing zone not adversely impact beneficial uses. Beneficial uses will not be adversely affected for the same reasons discussed above. In determining the size of the mixing zone, the Central Valley Water Board considered the procedures and guidelines in U.S. EPA’s *Water Quality Standards Handbook, 2nd Edition* (updated July 2007), section 5.1, and section 2.2.2 of the TSD. The SIP incorporates the same guidelines.

- vii. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Specific Constituents (Pollutant-by-Pollutant Evaluation).** As discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, based on existing effluent data, it appears the Facility cannot meet the end-of-pipe (no dilution) WQBEL’s for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc.

¹ TSD, pg. 33

The allowance of a mixing zone and dilution credits is a discretionary act by the Central Valley Water Board. When determining the appropriate dilution credits for a specific pollutant, several factors must be considered, such as available assimilative capacity, Facility performance, and best practicable treatment or control (BPTC). The Central Valley Water Board has determined the allowable dilution credits on a constituent-by-constituent basis.

The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc. As discussed above, acute, chronic, and human health mixing zones with associated dilution credits of 9, 14, and 189, respectively, meet the mixing zone conditions specified in section 1.4.2.2.A of the SIP. However, an overarching mixing zone condition is that “A *mixing zone shall be as small as practicable*,” and section 1.4.2.2.B requires, “*The RWQCB shall deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to protect beneficial uses, meet the conditions of this Policy, or comply with other regulatory requirements.*”

The Central Valley Water Board considered Facility performance and the receiving water’s assimilative capacity for each individual pollutant in determining the dilution needed. The consideration of these factors is necessary to avoid allocating an unnecessarily large portion of the receiving water’s assimilative capacity for each pollutant and possibly violating the Antidegradation Policy. Based on Facility performance, the full dilution credits, as discussed above, are not needed for dichlorobromomethane and zinc and have been reduced to ensure compliance with the mixing zone provisions of the SIP. Based on Facility performance for ammonia and copper, this Order utilizes the maximum acute aquatic life dilution credit of 9 and the maximum chronic aquatic life dilution credit of 14.

Table F-9. Dilution Credits Associated with Performance-Based Effluent Limitations

Pollutant	Units	ECA	Criterion	Background	Dilution Credit ¹
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	56 (Acute) 48 (Chronic)	5.62 (Acute) ² 3.18 (Chronic) ³	<0.010	9 (Acute) 14 (Chronic)
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	54 (Basin Plan) 54 (Chronic)	6.4 (Basin Plan) 4.6 (Chronic)	1.1	9 (Basin Plan) 14 (Chronic)
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	25	0.56	<0.080	49.9 (HH)
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	140 (Basin Plan) 94 (Chronic)	18 (Basin Plan) 60 (Chronic)	1.2	7.4 (Basin Plan) 0.56 (Chronic)

¹ The dilution credit is calculated using the steady-state mass balance equation rearranged to solve for the dilution credit, as follows:

$$D = (ECA - C) / (C - B)$$

² U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 1-hour average.

³ U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 30-day average.

The revised mixing zones and dilution credits for ammonia, copper, and zinc will result in a minor increase in the discharge (i.e., use of less than 10 percent of the available assimilative capacity for these constituents in the receiving water). According to U.S. EPA’s memorandum on Tier 2 Antidegradation Reviews and Significance Thresholds, any individual decision to lower water quality for non-bioaccumulative chemicals that is limited to 10 percent of the

available assimilative capacity represents minimal risk to the receiving water and is fully consistent with the objectives and goals of the Clean Water Act.

The revised mixing zone and dilution credit for dichlorobromomethane will result in an increase in the discharge that results in the use of greater than 10 percent of the available assimilative capacity for this constituent. As described in section IV.D.4 of this Fact Sheet, the Discharger submitted an antidegradation analysis with the ROWD that justifies the relaxation of performance-based effluent limits for dichlorobromomethane. The Central Valley Water Board has determined the Discharger's antidegradation analysis is consistent with the state and federal antidegradation requirements.

- viii. **Regulatory Compliance for Dilution Credits and Mixing Zones.** To fully comply with all applicable laws, regulations and policies of the state, the Central Valley Water Board-approved mixing zones and the associated dilution credits are based on the following:
- (a) Mixing zones are allowed under the SIP provided all elements contained in section 1.4.2.2 are met. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that these factors are met.
 - (b) Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires mixing zones to be as small as practicable. The Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zones are as small as practicable.
 - (c) In accordance with section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP, the Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zones are as small as practicable and will not compromise the integrity of the entire water body, restrict the passage of aquatic life, dominate the water body, or overlap existing mixing zones from different outfalls. The mixing zones are small relative to the large size of the receiving water, are not at or near a drinking water intake, and do not overlap a mixing zone from a different outfall.
 - (d) The Central Valley Water Board is allowing mixing zones for acute aquatic life, chronic aquatic life, and human health constituents, and has determined allowing such mixing zones will not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone.
 - (e) The Central Valley Water Board has determined the discharge will not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under the federal or state endangered species laws, because the mixing zones are relatively small and acutely toxic conditions will not occur in the mixing zones. The discharge will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum, produce objectionable odor, taste, or turbidity, cause objectionable bottom deposits, or cause nuisance, because the Order establishes end-of-pipe effluent limitations (e.g., for BOD₅ and TSS) and discharge prohibitions to prevent these conditions from occurring.
 - (f) As required by the SIP, in determining the extent of or whether to allow mixing zones and dilution credits, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the presence of pollutants in the discharge that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, teratogenic, persistent, bioaccumulative, or attractive to aquatic organisms, and concluded that the allowance of the mixing zones and dilution credits are adequately protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

- (g) The Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zones comply with the SIP for priority pollutants.
- (h) Section 1.4.2.2.B of the SIP, in part states, *"The RWQCB shall deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to protect beneficial uses, meet the conditions of this Policy, or comply with other regulatory requirements."* The Central Valley Water Board has determined full allowance of dilution is not needed or necessary for the Discharger to achieve compliance with this Order, except for effluent limitations for ammonia and copper, as described above.
- (i) The Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zones comply with the Basin Plan for non-priority pollutants. The Basin Plan requires a mixing zone not adversely impact beneficial uses. Beneficial uses will not be adversely affected for the same reasons discussed above. In determining the size of the mixing zones, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the procedures and guidelines in section 5.1 of U.S. EPA's *Water Quality Standards Handbook*, 2nd Edition (updated July 2007) and section 2.2.2 of the TSD. The SIP incorporates the same guidelines.
- (j) The Central Valley Water Board has determined that allowing dilution factors that exceed those proposed by this Order would not comply with the State Antidegradation Policy for receiving waters outside the allowable mixing zones for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc. The State Antidegradation Policy incorporates the federal Antidegradation Policy and requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. Item 2 of the State Antidegradation Policy states:

"Any activity which produces or may produce a waste or increased volume or concentration of waste and which discharges or proposes to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained."

The Central Valley Water Board has determined the effluent limitations required by this Order will result in the Discharger implementing BPTC of the discharge necessary to assure that pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state will be maintained.

Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board has determined the effluent limitations established in the Order for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc, which have been adjusted for dilution credits, are appropriate and necessary to comply with the Basin Plan, SIP, federal antidegradation regulations, and the State Antidegradation Policy.

- d. **Conversion Factors.** The CTR contains aquatic life criteria for arsenic, cadmium, chromium III, chromium VI, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc, which are presented in dissolved concentrations. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The default U.S. EPA

conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 of the SIP were used to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria.

- e. **Hardness-Dependent CTR Metals Criteria.** The CTR and the NTR contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness, the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.

This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the hardness of the receiving water (actual ambient hardness) as required by the SIP¹ and the CTR.² The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. The CTR requires that the hardness values used shall be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones.³ Design flows for aquatic life criteria include the 1Q10 and the 7Q10.⁴ This section of the CTR also indicates that the design conditions should be established such that the appropriate criteria are not exceeded more than once in a 3-year period, on average.⁵ The CTR requires that when mixing zones are allowed, the CTR criteria apply at the edge of the mixing zone, otherwise the criteria apply throughout the water body including at the point of discharge.⁶ The CTR does not define the term “ambient,” as applied in the regulations. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board has considerable discretion to consider upstream and downstream ambient conditions when establishing the appropriate water quality criteria that fully comply with the CTR and SIP.

i. **Summary Findings**

The ambient hardness for the Sacramento River is represented by the data in Figure F-1, below, which shows ambient hardness ranging from 9 mg/L to 60 mg/L based on collected ambient data from September 2014 through June 2017. Given the high variability in ambient hardness values, there is no single hardness value that describes the ambient receiving water for all possible scenarios (e.g., minimum, maximum). Because of this variability, staff has determined that based on representative ambient hardness concentrations measured in the receiving water, the Central Valley Water Board has discretion to select ambient hardness values within the range of 9 mg/L (minimum) up to 60 mg/L (maximum). Staff recommends that the Board use the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-10 for the following reasons.

- (a) Using the ambient receiving water hardness values shown in Table F-10 will result in criteria and effluent limitations that ensure protection of beneficial uses under all ambient receiving water conditions.
- (b) The Water Code mandates that the Central Valley Water Board establish permit terms that will ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses. In this case, using the lowest measured ambient hardness to calculate

¹ The SIP does not address how to determine the hardness for application to the equations for the protection of aquatic life when using hardness-dependent metals criteria. It simply states, in section 1.2, that the criteria shall be properly adjusted for hardness using the hardness of the receiving water.

² The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO₃), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used (40 C.F.R. § 131.38(c)(4)).

³ 40 C.F.R. §131.3(c)(4)(ii)

⁴ 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4

⁵ 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4, notes 1 and 2

⁶ 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(i)

effluent limitations is not required to protect beneficial uses. Calculating effluent limitations based on the lowest measured ambient hardness is not required by the CTR or SIP, and is not reasonable as it would result in overly conservative limits that will impart substantial costs to the Discharger and ratepayers without providing any additional protection of beneficial uses. In compliance with applicable state and federal regulatory requirements, after considering the representative range of ambient hardness values, Central Valley Water Board staff has used the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-10 to calculate the proposed effluent limitations for hardness-dependent metals. The proposed effluent limitations are protective of beneficial uses under all flow conditions.

- (c) Using an ambient hardness that is higher than the minimum of 9 mg/L will result in limits that may allow increased metals to be discharged to the Sacramento River, but such discharge is allowed under the State Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16). The Central Valley Water Board finds that this degradation is consistent with the Antidegradation Policy (see antidegradation findings in section IV.D.4 of the Fact Sheet). The Antidegradation Policy requires the Discharger to meet WDR's that will result in the BPTC of the discharge necessary to assure that: a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur, and b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state will be maintained.
- (d) Using the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-10 is consistent with the CTR and SIP's requirements for developing metals criteria.

Table F-10. Summary of CTR Criteria and Site-Specific Basin Plan Objectives for Hardness-Dependent Metals

CTR Metals	Ambient Hardness (mg/L) ^{2,3}	CTR Criteria (µg/L, total recoverable) ¹		Basin Plan Objective (µg/L, total recoverable) ¹
		Acute	Chronic	Maximum Concentration
Copper	44	6.5	4.6	6.4
Chromium III	44	890	110	--
Cadmium	44 (Acute) 44 (Chronic)	1.3	1.8	0.26
Lead	44	29	1.1	--
Nickel	44	230	26	--
Silver	44	0.99	--	--
Zinc	44	60	60	18

¹ Metal criteria rounded to two significant figures in accordance with the CTR (40 C.F.R. section 131.38(b)(2)).

² The ambient hardness values in this table represent actual observed receiving water hardness measurements from the dataset shown in Figure F-1.

³ The Basin Plan and CTR hardness-dependent metals criteria equations vary depending on the metal, which results in differences in the range of ambient hardness values that may be used to develop effluent limitations that are protective of beneficial uses and comply with the Basin Plan objective and CTR criteria for all ambient flow conditions.

ii. Background

The State Water Board provided direction regarding the selection of hardness in two precedential water quality orders; WQO 2008-0008 for the City of Davis

Wastewater Treatment Plant (Davis Order) and WQO 2004-0013 for the Yuba City Wastewater Treatment Plant (Yuba City Order). The State Water Board recognized that the SIP and the CTR do not discuss the manner in which hardness is to be ascertained, thus regional water boards have considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness so long as the selected value is protective of water quality criteria under the given flow conditions (Davis Order, p.10). The State Water Board explained that it is necessary that, "*The [hardness] value selected should provide protection for all times of discharge under varying hardness conditions.*" (Yuba City Order, p. 8). The Davis Order also provides that, "*Regardless of the hardness used, the resulting limits must always be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions.*" (Davis Order, p. 11)

The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR, is as follows:

$$\text{CTR Criterion} = \text{WER} \times (e^{m[\ln(H)]+b}) \text{ (Equation 1)}$$

Where:

H = ambient hardness (as CaCO_3)¹

WER = water-effect ratio

m, b = metal- and criterion-specific constants

The direction in the CTR regarding hardness selection is that it must be based on ambient hardness and consistent with design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones. Consistent with design discharge conditions and design flows means that the selected "design" hardness must result in effluent limitations under design discharge conditions that do not result in more than one exceedance of the applicable criteria in a 3-year period.² Where design flows for aquatic life criteria include the 1Q10 and the 7Q10. The 1Q10 and 7Q10 Sacramento River flows are 79.9 cfs and 81.5 cfs, respectively.


iii. **Ambient Conditions**

The ambient receiving water hardness varied from 9 mg/L to 60 mg/L, based on 67 samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017 (see Figure F-1).

¹ For this discussion, all hardness values are expressed in mg/L as CaCO_3 .

² 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4, notes 1 and 2

Figure F-1. Observed Ambient Hardness Concentrations 9 mg/L – 60 mg/L



In this analysis, the entire range of ambient hardness concentrations shown in Figure F-1 were considered to determine the appropriate ambient hardness to calculate the CTR criteria and effluent limitations that are protective under representative discharge conditions.

iv. Approach to Derivation of Criteria

As shown above, ambient hardness varies substantially. Because of the variation, there is no single hardness value that describes the ambient receiving water for all possible scenarios (e.g., minimum, maximum, mid-point). While the hardness selected must be hardness of the ambient receiving water, selection of an ambient receiving water hardness that is too high would result in effluent limitations that do not protect beneficial uses. Also, the use of minimum ambient hardness would result in criteria that are protective of beneficial uses, but such criteria may not be representative considering the wide range of ambient conditions.

Reasonable worst-case ambient conditions. To determine whether a selected ambient hardness value results in effluent limitations that are fully protective while complying with federal regulations and state policy, staff have conducted an analysis considering varying ambient hardness and flow conditions. To do this, the Central Valley Water Board has ensured that the receiving water hardness and criteria selected for effluent limitations are protective under “reasonable-worst case ambient conditions.” These conditions represent the receiving water conditions under which derived effluent limitations would ensure protection of beneficial uses under all ambient flow and hardness conditions.

Reasonable worst-case ambient conditions:

- (a) "Low receiving water flow." CTR design discharge conditions (1Q10 and 7Q10) have been selected to represent reasonable worst case receiving water flow conditions.
- (b) "High receiving water flow (maximum receiving water flow)." This additional flow condition has been selected consistent with the Davis Order, which required that the hardness selected be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions.
- (c) "Low receiving water hardness." The CTR requires that the hardness values used shall be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones, where design flows are equal to the 1Q10 and 7Q10. Since ambient hardness data collected by the Discharger is limited at the 1Q10 and 7Q10 of 79.9 cfs and 81.5 cfs, respectively, hardness data was evaluated when Sacramento River flows at Dunsmuir were less than 350 cfs, determined based on flow measurements at the Delta Station and adjusted based on the mixing zone update calculations submitted with the ROWD. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that Sacramento River flows below the 350 cfs threshold are representative of low-flow conditions. Ambient hardness data ranged from 44 mg/L to 60 mg/L when Sacramento River flows at Dunsmuir were less than 350 cfs. Thus, a receiving water hardness condition of 44 mg/L was selected to represent the reasonable worst case receiving water hardness.
- (d) "Background ambient metal concentration at criteria." This condition assumes that the metal concentration in the background receiving water is equal to CTR criteria (upstream of the Facility's discharge). Based on data in the record, this is a design condition that does not regularly occur in the receiving water and is used in this analysis to ensure that limits are protective of beneficial uses even in the situation where there is no assimilative capacity.

v. **Approach to Derivation of Criteria Where No Dilution Allowed**

As shown in Table F-10 above, an ambient hardness value of 44 mg/L, which represents the minimum ambient hardness value observed during the discharge season when Sacramento River flows were below 350 cfs, was selected to calculate CTR hardness-dependent metals criteria. Using this hardness value, which is an actual sample result collected in the receiving water, will result in effluent limitations that are protective under all ambient flow conditions. Nickel and silver are used as examples below to illustrate the results of the analysis. Tables F-11 and F-12, below, summarize the numeric results of the three-step iterative approach for nickel and silver. As shown in the example tables, an ambient hardness value of 44 mg/L is used in the CTR equations to derive criteria and effluent limitations for nickel and silver. Then, under the "check" step, worst-case ambient receiving water conditions are used to test whether discharge results in compliance with CTR criteria and protection of beneficial uses.

The results of the above analysis, summarized in the tables below, show that the design ambient hardness value of 44 mg/L results in protective effluent limitations that achieve CTR criteria under all flow conditions. Tables F-11 and

F-12, below, summarize the critical flow conditions. However, the analysis evaluated all flow conditions to ensure compliance with the CTR criteria at all times.

Table F-11. Verification of CTR Compliance for Nickel

Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations				44 mg/L
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Nickel ¹				26 µg/L
	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Nickel Concentration ² (µg/L)	
1Q10	44	26	26	Yes
7Q10	44	26	26	Yes
Max receiving water flow	44	26	26	Yes

¹ The ECA defines effluent quality necessary to meet the CTR criteria in the receiving water. There are no effluent limitations for nickel as it demonstrates no reasonable potential.

² This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

Table F-12. Verification of CTR Compliance for Silver

Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations				44 mg/L
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Silver ¹				0.99 µg/L
	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Silver Concentration ² (µg/L)	
1Q10	44	1.0	1.0	Yes
7Q10	44	1.0	1.0	Yes
Max receiving water flow	44	1.0	1.0	Yes

¹ The ECA defines effluent quality necessary to meet the CTR criteria in the receiving water. There are no effluent limitations for silver as it demonstrates no reasonable potential.

² This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

vi. Approach to Derivation of Criteria Where Dilution Allowed

As discussed in section IV.C.2.c, above, dilution credits for copper and zinc have been allowed in the calculation of WQBEL's for these hardness-dependent criteria parameters. The allowed copper dilution credit for chronic aquatic life criteria is 14:1, which represents an effluent fraction of 6.7%, and the allowed zinc dilution credit for chronic aquatic life criteria is 0.57:1, which results in an effluent fraction of 64%. These values define the points in the receiving water (i.e., edge of mixing zone) that must be in compliance with aquatic life criteria. When the effluent and receiving water are at their respective minimum hardness values (i.e., 50 mg/L and 44 mg/L as CaCO₃,

respectively), and the effluent fraction is 6.7% and 64%, the mixed hardness is 44 mg/L and 47 mg/L (as CaCO₃), respectively. An actual observed ambient hardness of 44 mg/L (as CaCO₃) has been used in this Order for calculating hardness-dependent copper and zinc chronic criteria based on the minimum ambient hardness value observed during the discharge season when Sacramento River flows were below 350 cfs. Using the ambient hardness to calculate the hardness-dependent metals criteria is consistent with the CTR and the SIP.

Tables F-13 and F-14, below, demonstrate that protective effluent limitations result when using this approach for determining the appropriate hardness. In this example the mixed receiving water copper and zinc concentrations do not exceed the mixed CTR criteria for copper and zinc at the edge of the mixing zone.

Table F-13. Verification of CTR Compliance for Copper

Minimum Ambient Background Hardness				44 mg/L
Minimum Effluent Hardness				50 mg/L
Chronic Aquatic Life Dilution Credit				14:1
Maximum Ambient Background Copper Concentration				1.1 µg/L
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Copper¹				54 µg/L
Effluent Fraction²	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Copper Concentration³ (µg/L)	
1.0%	44	4.6	4.6	Yes
2.0%	44	4.6	4.6	Yes
3.0%	44	4.6	4.6	Yes
4.0%	44	4.6	4.6	Yes
5.0%	44	4.7	4.6	Yes
6.7%	44	4.7	4.6	Yes

¹ ECA calculated per section 1.4 of the SIP.

² Table shows effluent fractions ranging from 1% to 6.7% to show conditions outside the approved mixing zone for copper.

³ This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

Table F-14. Verification of CTR Compliance for Zinc

Minimum Ambient Background Hardness				44 mg/L
Minimum Effluent Hardness				50 mg/L
Chronic Aquatic Life Dilution Credit				0.57:1
Maximum Ambient Background Zinc Concentration				1.2 µg/L
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Zinc ¹				93 µg/L
Effluent Fraction ²	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Zinc Concentration ³ (µg/L)	
1.0%	44	60	60	Yes
5.0%	44	60	60	Yes
15%	45	61	60	Yes
25%	46	61	60	Yes
50%	47	63	60	Yes
64%	48	64	60	Yes

¹ ECA calculated per section 1.4 of the SIP.

² Table shows effluent fractions ranging from 1% to 64% to show conditions outside the approved mixing zone for zinc.

³ This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

3. Determining the Need for WQBEL's

Clean Water Act section 301(b)(1)(C) requires effluent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards, and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires NPDES permits to include conditions that are necessary to achieve water quality standards established under section 303 of the CWA, including state narrative criteria for water quality. Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) state, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level that will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*"

Additionally, 40 C.F.R. section 122(d)(1)(vii) requires effluent limits to be developed consistent with any available WLA's developed and approved for the discharge. The process to determine whether a WQBEL is required as described in 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) is referred to as an RPA. Central Valley Water Board staff conducted RPA's for nearly 200 constituents, including the 126 U.S. EPA priority toxic pollutants. This section includes details of the RPA's for constituents of concern for the Facility. The entire RPA is included in the administrative record and a summary of the constituents of concern is provided in Attachment G. For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. For non-priority pollutants the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method; therefore, the RPA's have been conducted based on U.S. EPA guidance considering multiple lines of evidence and the site-specific conditions of the discharge.

- a. **Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** WQBEL's are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of an applicable water quality objective;

however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

Most constituents with no reasonable potential are not discussed in this Order. This section only provides the rationale for the RPA's for the following constituents of concern that were found to have no reasonable potential after assessment of the data:

i. **Salinity**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCL's, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for certain specified water bodies for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. The U.S. EPA National Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no U.S. EPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate. Additionally, there are no U.S. EPA numeric water quality criteria for the protection of agricultural, livestock, and industrial uses. Numeric values for the protection of these uses are typically based on site-specific conditions and evaluations to determine the appropriate constituent threshold necessary to interpret the narrative chemical constituent Basin Plan objective. The Central Valley Water Board must determine the applicable numeric limit to implement the narrative objective for the protection of agricultural supply. The Central Valley Water Board is currently implementing the Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS) initiative to develop a Basin Plan Amendment that will establish a salt and nitrate Management Plan for the Central Valley. Through this effort, the Basin Plan will be amended to define how the narrative water quality objective is to be interpreted for the protection of agricultural use. All studies conducted through this Order to establish an agricultural limit to implement the narrative objective will be reviewed by and consistent with the efforts currently underway by CV-SALTS.

Table F-15. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Objective ¹	Secondary MCL ²	U.S. EPA NAWQC	Effluent	
				Average ³	Max
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	860 1-hr 230 4-day	58	71.2
Electrical Conductivity (µmhos/cm) or Total Dissolved Solids (mg/L)	Varies	900, 1,600, 2,200 or 500, 1,000, 1,500	N/A	375 or 235	541 or 278
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	18	23.5

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Objective ¹	Secondary MCL ²	U.S. EPA NAWQC	Effluent	
				Average ³	Max

¹ Narrative chemical constituent objective of the Basin Plan. Procedures for establishing the applicable numeric limitation to implement the narrative objective can be found in the Policy for Application of Water Quality, chapter IV, section 8 of the Basin Plan. However, the Basin Plan does not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. In cases where the natural background concentration of a particular constituent exceeds an applicable water quality objective, the natural background concentration will be considered to comply with the objective.

² The Secondary MCL's are for protection of public welfare and are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.

³ Maximum calendar annual average.

(1) **Chloride.** The Secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum. The NAWQC acute criterion for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for chloride is 860 mg/L and the chronic criterion is 230 mg/L.

(2) **Electrical Conductivity or Total Dissolved Solids.** The Secondary MCL for electrical conductivity is 900 µmhos/cm as a recommended level, 1,600 µmhos/cm as an upper level, and 2,200 µmhos/cm as a short-term maximum, or when expressed as total dissolved solids is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1,000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1,500 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

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

(b) **RPA Results**

(1) **Chloride.** Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 21.1 mg/L to 71.2 mg/L, with a maximum annual average of 58 mg/L based on four samples collected during the discharge season between September 2014 and June 2017. The maximum annual average does not exceed the Secondary MCL recommended level and the maximum effluent chloride concentration of 71.2 mg/L does not exceed the NAWQC criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life. The maximum observed receiving water chloride concentration was 1.23 mg/L based on two samples collected during the discharge season between September 2014 and June 2017.

(2) **Electrical Conductivity or Total Dissolved Solids.** A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows a maximum observed annual average electrical conductivity of 375 µmhos/cm, with a range from 208 µmhos/cm to 541 µmhos/cm. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL recommended level. The maximum observed receiving water electrical conductivity was 111 µmhos/cm based on 109 samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017.

Total dissolved solids concentrations in the effluent ranged from 138 mg/L to 278 mg/L, with a maximum annual average of 235 mg/L

based on four samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL recommended level. The maximum observed receiving water total dissolved solids concentration was 69 mg/L based on three samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017.

- (3) **Sulfate.** Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 10.9 mg/L to 23.5 mg/L, with a maximum annual average of 18 mg/L, based on four samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL recommended level. The maximum observed receiving water sulfate concentration was 1.8 mg/L based on two samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017.

Based on the relatively low levels of salinity, the discharge does not have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above applicable water quality objectives. However, since the Discharger discharges to the Sacramento River, a tributary of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, of additional concern is the salt contribution to Delta waters. Allowing the Discharger to increase its current salt loading may be contrary to the Region-wide effort to address salinity in the Central Valley. Therefore, in order to ensure the Discharger will continue to control the discharge of salinity, this Order requires the Discharger to continue to implement a salinity evaluation and minimization plan.

ii. **Settleable Solids**

- (a) **WQO.** For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states that “[w]ater shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.” Order R5-2012-0085 contained an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for settleable solids based on the Basin Plan’s narrative objective.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Settleable solids were not detected in the effluent based on 744 samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance in the receiving water and the Facility is adequately controlling the discharge of settleable solids. Since the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential, the effluent limitations for settleable solids have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

iii. **Nitrate and Nitrite**

WQO. The State Water Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW) has adopted Primary MCL’s for the protection of human health for nitrite and nitrate that are equal to 1.0 mg/L and 10 mg/L (measured as nitrogen), respectively. DDW has also adopted a Primary MCL of 10 mg/L for the sum of nitrate and nitrite, measured as nitrogen. U.S. EPA has developed a Primary MCL and an MCL goal of 1.0 mg/L for nitrite (measured as

nitrogen). For nitrate, U.S. EPA has developed Drinking Water Standards (10 mg/L as Primary MCL) and NAWQC for protection of human health (10 mg/L for non-cancer health effects).

- (a) **RPA Results.** Nitrate concentrations in the effluent ranged from ND to 6.74 mg/L based on 36 monthly samples. The MEC for nitrate is below the Primary MCL. Nitrite concentrations in the effluent ranged from ND (4 samples) to 0.074 mg/L based on 11 samples. The MEC for nitrite is below the Primary MCL. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance in the receiving water and the Facility is adequately controlling the discharge of nitrate and nitrite. Since the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential, the effluent limitation for nitrate plus nitrite has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).
- b. **Constituents with No Data or Insufficient Data.** Reasonable potential cannot be determined for the following constituents because effluent data are limited or ambient background concentrations are not available. The Discharger is required to continue to monitor for these constituents in the effluent using analytical methods that provide the best feasible detection limits. When additional data become available, further analysis will be conducted to determine whether to add numeric effluent limitations or to continue monitoring.

- i. **Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 1.8 µg/L for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Based on effluent data collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017, bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected but not quantified (DNQ) at an estimated concentration of 1.9 µg/L and detected at a concentration of 4.1 µg/L in samples collected on 20 April 2016 and 29 December 2016, respectively. These effluent concentrations exceed the CTR human health criterion for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate.

Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is commonly used as a plasticizer and, therefore, needs to be sampled with glass containers in order to avoid false positive results. In the ROWD, the Discharger explained that effluent bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate samples collected on 20 April 2016 and 29 December 2016 were collected as composite samples and stored in plastic containers within a composite sampling machine. The storage of the effluent samples in the plastic bottles could have led to the increased effluent concentrations of bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate observed in the composite samples. The Discharger collected a grab sample for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in the effluent on 22 March 2017, using a glass bottle, in order to confirm that the use of plastic bottles was causing the elevated results for this constituent. The result of the grab sample was DNQ at an estimated concentration of 1.0 µg/L, which is below the applicable CTR human health criterion.

Section 1.3, step 8 of the SIP allows the Central Valley Water Board to require additional monitoring for a pollutant in place of an effluent limitation if data are unavailable or insufficient. Instead of effluent limitations, monitoring for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate will be required semi-annually during the year 2020 as part of the effluent and receiving water characterization. Should monitoring results indicate that the discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

- c. **Constituents with Reasonable Potential.** The Central Valley Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality standard for ammonia, BOD₅, chlorine residual, copper, dichlorobromomethane, pH, total coliform organisms, TSS, and zinc. WQBEL's for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

i. **Ammonia**

- (a) **WQO.** The 1999 U.S. EPA NAWQC for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total ammonia (the "1999 Criteria"), recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based on pH and temperature. U.S. EPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC.

U.S. EPA recently published national recommended water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life from the toxic effects of ammonia in freshwater (the "2013 Criteria").¹ The 2013 Criteria is an update to U.S. EPA's 1999 Criteria and varies based on pH and temperature. Although the 2013 Criteria reflects the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia to certain freshwater aquatic life, including new toxicity data on sensitive freshwater mussels in the Family Unionidae, the species tested for development of the 2013 Criteria may not be present in some Central Valley waterways. The 2013 Criteria document therefore states that, "*unionid mussel species are not prevalent in some waters, such as the arid west ...*" and provides that, "*In the case of ammonia, where a state demonstrates that mussels are not present on a site-specific basis, the recalculation procedure may be used to remove the mussel species from the national criteria data set to better represent the species present at the site.*"

The Central Valley Water Board issued a 3 April 2014 *California Water Code section 13267 Order for Information: 2013 Final Ammonia Criteria for Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life* (13267 Order) requiring the Discharger to either participate in an individual or group study to determine the presence of mussels or submit a method of compliance for complying with effluent limitations calculated assuming mussels present using the 2013 Criteria. The Discharger submitted a letter to the Central Valley Water Board indicating their participation in the Central Valley

¹ Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Freshwater, published August 2013 [EPA 822-R-13-001]

Clean Water Association (CVCWA) Freshwater Collaborative Mussel Study. Studies are currently underway to determine how the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia reflected in the 2013 Criteria can be implemented in the Central Valley Region as part of a Basin Planning effort to adopt nutrient and ammonia objectives. Until the Basin Planning process is completed, the Central Valley Water Board will continue to implement the 1999 Criteria to interpret the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. The 1999 Criteria recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based on pH and temperature. U.S. EPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. U.S. EPA found that as pH increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia increased. Salmonids were more sensitive to acute toxicity effects than other species. However, while the acute toxicity of ammonia was not influenced by temperature, it was found that invertebrates and young fish experienced increasing chronic toxicity effects with increasing temperature. Because the Sacramento River has a beneficial use of cold freshwater habitat and the presence of salmonids and early fish life stages is well-documented, the recommended criteria for waters where salmonids and early life stages are present were used.

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.0 at Discharge Point 001 based on a request submitted by the Discharger prior to the adoption of Order R5-2012-0085. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an organism, a pH value of 8.0 was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion is 5.62 mg/L.

A chronic criterion was calculated for each day when paired pH and temperature data were measured using downstream receiving water data for pH and temperature. Rolling 30-day average criteria were calculated from downstream receiving water data using the criteria calculated for each day and the minimum observed 30-day average criterion was established as the applicable 30-day average chronic criterion, or 30-day CCC. The most stringent 30-day CCC was 0.24 mg/L (as N) based on downstream receiving water pH and temperature data collected from September 2014 through June 2017. The 4-day average concentration is derived in accordance with the U.S. EPA criterion as 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. Based on the 30-day CCC of 0.24 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 0.60 mg/L (as N).

Elevated pH measurements (greater than 9.0) were observed in the downstream receiving water based on samples collected at Monitoring Location RSW-002 during the discharge season from September 2014 and June 2017, which had a significant influence on the calculation of chronic ammonia criteria. The Discharger provided information to the Central Valley Water Board indicating the presence of algae growth in the vicinity of Monitoring Location RSW-002 and indicated that the receiving water may be subject to varying pH throughout the day, similar to diurnal patterns observed within ponds containing algae cover. Based on a side-by-side analysis of downstream receiving water samples collected at Monitoring Location RSW-002 in the morning compared to samples collected in the afternoon, the Discharger concluded that the pH of

samples taken in the morning are consistently less than the pH of samples taken in the afternoon. The Central Valley Water Board also examined pH samples collected within the Sacramento River upstream of the Facility, including at Mt. Shasta WWTP and the Dunsmuir Railyard, to determine whether or not similar diurnal patterns exist. The Sacramento River pH data collected at the Mt. Shasta WWTP and the Dunsmuir Railyard indicated that similarly timed minimum and maximum pH values occur throughout the year; however, the pH values recorded at these upstream locations were significantly lower than those recorded in the vicinity of the Facility. Additionally, in late 2016, the Discharger recognized that the portable pH probe being utilized did not produce the same result as the pH probe used in the Facility's on-site lab. In response, beginning in 2017, the Discharger switched to measuring receiving water pH with the on-site lab pH probe only. None of the evaluated samples collected at Monitoring Location RSW-002 in 2017 returned pH readings above 9.0.

Due to the uncertainty in the validity of pH results collected at Monitoring Location RSW-002 during the discharge season between September 2014 and June 2017, the Central Valley Water Board has retained the 30-day CCC and 4-day CCC from Order R5-2012-0085 of 3.18 mg/L and 7.95 mg/L, respectively, for the purposes of the RPA and WQBEL calculations for ammonia in this Order.

- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that are harmful to aquatic life and exceed the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) require that, *"Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality."* For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Ammonia is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, *"State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters)."* U.S. EPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, *"When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the*

regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.” With regard to POTW’s, U.S. EPA recommends that, “POTW’s should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.” (TSD, p. 50)

Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger currently uses nitrification to remove ammonia from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream. Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. Discharges of ammonia in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life would violate the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. Although the Discharger nitrifies the discharge, inadequate or incomplete nitrification creates the potential for ammonia to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for ammonia and WQBEL’s are required.

- (c) **WQBEL’s.** The Central Valley Water Board calculates WQBEL’s in accordance with SIP procedures for non-CTR constituents, and ammonia is a non-CTR constituent. The SIP procedure assumes a 4-day averaging period for calculating the long-term average discharge condition (LTA). However, U.S. EPA recommends modifying the procedure for calculating permit limits for ammonia using a 30-day averaging period for the calculation of the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC and specifies that “...the value of “n” (assumed monitoring frequency) used in the AML calculation should not be less than the averaging period upon which the criterion value is based”.¹ Therefore, while the LTA’s corresponding to the acute and 4-day chronic criteria were calculated according to SIP procedures, the LTA and AMEL multiplier corresponding to the 30-day CCC was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period and a monthly sampling frequency (n) of 30. The lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day CCC, and 30-day CCC is then selected for deriving the AMEL and the average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL). The remainder of the WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures.

The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for ammonia; therefore, as discussed in section IV.C.2.c, an acute aquatic life dilution credit of 9:1 and a chronic aquatic life dilution credit of 14:1 were allowed in the development of WQBEL’s for ammonia. Based on the allowable dilution credits, this Order retains the AMEL of 22 mg/L from Order R5-2012-0085 and establishes an AWEL of 45 mg/L based on the NAWQC.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Based on the analysis of existing effluent data, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that immediate

¹ 64 FR 71974

compliance with the performance-based WQBEL's for ammonia is feasible.

ii. **Chlorine Residual**

- (a) **WQO.** U.S. EPA developed NAWQC for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The concentrations of chlorine used to disinfect wastewater are high enough to harm aquatic life and violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential, therefore, does exist and effluent limits are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) require that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Chlorine is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" U.S. EPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" With regard to POTW's, U.S. EPA recommends that, "*POTW's should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.*" (TSD, p. 50)

The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. Although the Discharger uses a sulfur dioxide process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to the Sacramento River, the existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged

provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** The TSD contains statistical methods for converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-hour) aquatic life criteria to AMEL's and MDEL's based on the variability of the existing data and the expected frequency of monitoring. However, because chlorine is an acutely toxic constituent that can and will be monitored continuously, an average 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively, based on U.S. EPA's NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective for the protection of aquatic life.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Discharger uses sulfur dioxide to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to the Sacramento River. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iii. **Copper**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. These criteria for copper are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. Default U.S. EPA translators were used for the effluent and receiving water. As described in section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet, the applicable acute and chronic criteria for copper in the effluent are 6.5 µg/L and 4.6 µg/L, respectively, as total recoverable.

The Basin Plan includes a site-specific, hardness-dependent, maximum concentration water quality objective for the Sacramento River and its tributaries above the State Highway 32 Bridge at Hamilton City. Using U.S. EPA conversion factors and the selected ambient hardness described in section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet, the applicable Basin Plan maximum concentration objective for copper in the effluent is 6.4 µg/L, as total recoverable.

Footnote 4, page 3 of the Introduction of the SIP states, *"If a water quality objective and a CTR criterion are in effect for the same priority pollutant, the more stringent of the two applies."* The Basin Plan objective cannot be directly compared to the CTR criteria to determine the most stringent objective because they have different averaging periods and the CTR criteria vary with hardness. In this situation, the RPA has been conducted considering both the CTR criteria and the Basin Plan site-specific objective. Order R5-2012-0085 included effluent limitations for copper based on the CTR criteria and the Basin Plan maximum concentration objective.

- (b) **RPA Results.** The maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for copper in the effluent was 20.6 µg/L (as total recoverable) based on 17 samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. The maximum observed upstream receiving water concentration was 1.1 µg/L (as total recoverable) based on six samples collected from September 2014 through June 2017. Therefore, copper in the discharge

has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life and the Basin Plan site-specific objective.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for copper; therefore, as discussed in section IV.C.2.c, an acute aquatic life dilution credit of 9:1 and a chronic aquatic life dilution credit of 14:1 were allowed in the development of WQBEL's for copper. Based on the allowable dilution credits, this Order contains an AMEL of 29 µg/L and an MDEL of 54 µg/L based on the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life and the Basin Plan site-specific objective.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 20.6 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iv. **Dichlorobromomethane**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.56 µg/L for dichlorobromomethane for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed. Order R5-2012-0085 included effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane based on the CTR human health criterion.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for dichlorobromomethane was 4.56 µg/L based on 20 samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. Dichlorobromomethane was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on four samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (c) **WQBEL's.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane, therefore, as discussed in section IV.C.2.c, a human health dilution credit of 90.5:1 was allowed in the development of WQBEL's for dichlorobromomethane based on Facility performance. Therefore, this Order contains an AMEL of 25 µg/L and MDEL of 72 µg/L based on Facility performance and the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 4.56 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

v. **Pathogens**

- (a) **WQO.** In a letter to the Central Valley Water Board dated 8 April 1999, DDW indicated it would consider wastewater discharged to water bodies with identified beneficial uses of irrigation or contact recreation and where the wastewater receives dilution of more than 20:1 to be adequately disinfected if the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and if the effluent coliform

concentration does not exceed 240 MPN/100 mL more than once in any 30-day period.

DDW has developed reclamation criteria, CCR, division 4, chapter 3 (Title 22), for the reuse of wastewater. Title 22 requires that for spray irrigation of food crops, parks, playgrounds, schoolyards, and other areas of similar public access, wastewater be adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, and filtered, and that the effluent total coliform levels not exceed 2.2 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median; 23 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period; and 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

Title 22 also requires that recycled water used as a source of water supply for non-restricted recreational impoundments be disinfected tertiary recycled water that has been subjected to conventional treatment. A non-restricted recreational impoundment is defined as “...an impoundment of recycled water, in which no limitations are imposed on body-contact water recreational activities.” Title 22 is not directly applicable to surface waters; however, the Central Valley Water Board finds that it is appropriate to apply an equivalent level of treatment to that required by DDW’s reclamation criteria from 1 May to 14 June and from 16 September through 15 November because the receiving water is used for irrigation of agricultural land and for contact recreation purposes during certain periods throughout the year. The stringent disinfection criteria of Title 22 are appropriate since the undiluted effluent may be used for the irrigation of food crops and/or for body-contact water recreation. Coliform organisms are intended as an indicator of the effectiveness of the entire treatment train and the effectiveness of removing other pathogens.

- (b) **RPA Results.** Municipal and domestic supply, agricultural irrigation, and body contact water recreation are beneficial uses of the Sacramento River. Based on a review of data submitted by the Discharger and the period of record for the United States Geological Survey monitoring stations on the Sacramento River, the last time less than 20:1 (river flow to design effluent flow) dilution was available was more than 15 years ago. Therefore, the DDW requirements are applicable to the discharge.
- (c) **WQBEL’s.** Pursuant to guidance from DDW, this Order includes effluent limitations for total coliform organisms of 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and 240 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period. In addition, from 1 May through 14 June and 16 September through 15 November, this Order requires effluent limitations for total coliform organisms of 2.2 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median, 23 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period; and 240 MPN/100 mL as an instantaneous maximum, in order to protect the beneficial uses of non-restricted contact recreation and irrigation in the Sacramento River during these parts of the year. These coliform limits are imposed to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water, including public health through contact recreation and drinking water pathways.

This Order contains effluent limitations for BOD₅, total coliform organisms, and TSS and requires a tertiary level of treatment, or equivalent, necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The

Central Valley Water Board has previously considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Final WQBEL's for BOD₅ and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. BOD₅ is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The tertiary treatment standards for BOD₅ and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the tertiary treatment process. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD₅ and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. The application of tertiary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD₅ and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed. Therefore, this Order requires AMEL's and AWEL's for BOD₅ and TSS of 10 mg/L and 15 mg/L, respectively, which are technically based on the capability of a tertiary system.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data collected during the discharge season indicates the Discharger can immediately comply with the applicable WQBEL's.

vi. **pH**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the "...pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5."
- (b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently has variable pH. Additionally, some wastewater treatment processes can increase or decrease wastewater pH, which if not properly controlled, would violate the Basin Plan's numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, reasonable potential exists for pH and WQBEL's are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) require that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. pH is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" U.S. EPA's TSD also

recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, *“When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.”* (TSD, p. 50)

The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Based on 812 samples taken during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017, the maximum pH reported was 7.84 and the minimum was 6.51. Although the Discharger has proper pH controls in place, the pH for the Facility's influent varies due to the nature of municipal sewage, which provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, WQBEL's for pH are required in this Order.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** An effluent limitation for pH of 6.5 as an instantaneous minimum is included in this Order based on the protection of the Basin Plan objective for pH. Order R5-2012-0085 included a more stringent instantaneous maximum pH limitation of 8.0, as requested by the Discharger. Effluent data collected over the term of Order R5-2012-0085 indicates that effluent pH was consistently below 8.0. Therefore, this Order retains the instantaneous maximum effluent pH limitation of 8.0 from Order R5-2012-0085.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Effluent pH ranged from 6.51 to 7.84. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that immediate compliance with the effluent limitations is feasible.

vii. **Zinc**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. These criteria for zinc are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. Default U.S. EPA translators were used for the effluent and receiving water. As described in section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet, the applicable acute and chronic criteria for zinc in the effluent are 60 µg/L, as total recoverable.

The Basin Plan includes a site-specific, hardness-dependent, maximum concentration water quality objective for the Sacramento River and its tributaries above the State Highway 32 Bridge at Hamilton City. Using U.S. EPA conversion factors and the selected ambient hardness described in section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet, the applicable Basin Plan maximum concentration objective for zinc in the effluent is 18 µg/L, as total recoverable.

Footnote 4, page 3 of the Introduction of the SIP states, *“If a water quality objective and a CTR criterion are in effect for the same priority pollutant, the more stringent of the two applies.”* The Basin Plan objective cannot be directly compared to the CTR criteria to determine the most stringent

objective because they have different averaging periods and the CTR criteria vary with hardness. In this situation, the RPA has been conducted considering both the CTR criteria and the Basin Plan site-specific objective. Order R5-2012-0085 included effluent limitations for zinc based on the CTR criteria and the Basin Plan maximum concentration objective.

- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for zinc in the effluent was 69.8 µg/L (as total recoverable) based on 18 samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. The maximum observed upstream receiving water concentration was 1.2 µg/L (as total recoverable) based on six samples collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017. Therefore, zinc in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life and the Basin Plan site-specific objective.
- (c) **WQBEL's.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for zinc; therefore, as discussed in section IV.C.2.c, an acute aquatic life dilution credit of 7.4:1 and a chronic aquatic life dilution credit of 0.57:1 were allowed in the development of WQBEL's for zinc. Based on the allowable dilution credits, this Order contains an AMEL of 81 µg/L and an MDEL of 140 µg/L based on the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life and the Basin Plan site-specific objective.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 69.8 µg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. This Order includes WQBEL's for ammonia, BOD₅, chlorine residual, copper, dichlorobromomethane, pH, total coliform organisms, TSS, and zinc. The general methodology for calculating WQBEL's based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.4.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.
- b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA).** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from section 1.4 of the SIP:

$$\begin{aligned} ECA &= C + D(C - B) && \text{where } C > B, \text{ and} \\ ECA &= C && \text{where } C \leq B \end{aligned}$$

where:

ECA = effluent concentration allowance
D = dilution credit
C = the priority pollutant criterion/objective
B = the ambient background concentration.

According to the SIP, the ambient background concentration (B) in the equation above shall be the observed maximum, with the exception that an ECA calculated from a priority pollutant criterion/objective that is intended to protect human health from carcinogenic effects shall use the arithmetic mean concentration of the ambient background samples.

- c. **Primary and Secondary MCL's.** For non-priority pollutants with Primary MCL's to protect human health (e.g., nitrate plus nitrite), the AMEL is set equal to the Primary MCL and the AWEL is calculated using an AWEL/AMEL multiplier, where the AWEL multiplier is based on a 98th percentile occurrence probability and the AMEL multiplier is from Table 2 of the SIP.
- For non-priority pollutants with Secondary MCL's that protect public welfare (e.g., taste, odor, and staining), WQBEL's were calculated by setting the LTA equal to the Secondary MCL and using the AMEL multiplier to set the AMEL. The AWEL was calculated using the MDEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP.
- d. **Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** For priority pollutants with acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria, the WQBEL's are calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECA's are converted to equivalent LTA's (i.e., LTA_{acute} and $LTA_{chronic}$) using statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers. For non-priority pollutants, WQBEL's are calculated using similar procedures, except that an AWEL is determined utilizing multipliers based on a 98th percentile occurrence probability.
- e. **Human Health Criteria.** For priority pollutants with human health criteria, the WQBEL's are calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The AMEL is set equal to the ECA and the MDEL is calculated using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP. For non-priority pollutants with human health criteria, WQBEL's are calculated using similar procedures, except that an AWEL is established using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP.

$$AMEL = mult_{AMEL} \left[\min \left(\overbrace{M_A ECA_{acute}}^{LTA_{acute}}, M_C ECA_{chronic} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL = mult_{MDEL} \left[\min \left(M_A ECA_{acute}, \underbrace{M_C ECA_{chronic}}_{LTA_{chronic}} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL_{HH} = \left(\frac{mult_{MDEL}}{mult_{AMEL}} \right) AMEL_{HH}$$

where:

$mult_{AMEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL
 $mult_{MDEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL
 M_A = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to LTA_{acute}
 M_C = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to $LTA_{chronic}$

**Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point 001**

Table F-16. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--
Priority Pollutants						
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	29	--	54	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	25	--	72	--	--
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	81	--	140	--	--
Non-Conventional Pollutants						
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	22	45	--	--	--
	lbs/day ¹	55	110	--	--	--
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.011 ²	0.019 ³	--	--
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL ⁴	--	23 ⁵	240 ⁶	--	--
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL ⁷	--	2.2 ⁵	23 ⁶	--	240

¹ Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.30 MGD.

² Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.

³ Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.

⁴ Applicable for discharges from 16 November through 30 April.

⁵ Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.

⁶ Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

⁷ Applicable for discharges from 1 May through 14 June and 16 September through 15 November.

5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct WET testing for acute and chronic toxicity, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) (Attachment E, section V). This Order also contains effluent limitations for acute toxicity and requires the Discharger to implement best management practices to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity.

- a. **Acute Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, "...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate..."

For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Acute WET is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is

not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA. U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" Although the discharge has been consistently in compliance with the acute effluent limitations, the Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater containing ammonia and other acutely toxic pollutants. Therefore, acute toxicity effluent limits are required to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

U.S. EPA Region 9 provided guidance for the development of acute toxicity effluent limitations in the absence of numeric water quality objectives for toxicity in its document titled "*Guidance for NPDES Permit Issuance*," dated February 1994. In section B.2. "Toxicity Requirements" (pgs. 14-15) it states that, "*In the absence of specific numeric water quality objectives for acute and chronic toxicity, the narrative criterion 'no toxics in toxic amounts' applies. Achievement of the narrative criterion, as applied herein, means that ambient waters shall not demonstrate for acute toxicity: 1) less than 90% survival, 50% of the time, based on the monthly median, or 2) less than 70% survival, 10% of the time, based on any monthly median. For chronic toxicity, ambient waters shall not demonstrate a test result of greater than 1 TUc.*" Consistent with Order R5-2012-0085, effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in this Order as follows:

Acute Toxicity. Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

Minimum for any one bioassay ----- 70%
Median for any three consecutive bioassays ----- 90%

- b. **Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) Table F-17, below, includes chronic WET data for testing performed by the Discharger from September 2014 through June 2017. This data was used to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

Table F-17. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results

Date	Fathead Minnow <i>Pimephales promelas</i>		Water Flea <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		Green Algae <i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
17 May 2016	1	1	1	1	1

- i. **RPA.** No dilution has been granted for chronic WET. Chronic toxicity testing results exceeding 1.3 chronic toxicity units (TUc) (as 100/NOEC) and a percent effect at 100 percent effluent exceeding 25 percent demonstrates the

discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Based on chronic toxicity testing conducted between September 2014 and June 2017, the maximum chronic toxicity result was 1 TUC on 17 May 2016 with a percent effect of 13.57 percent. Therefore, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream exceedance of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations

1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations

40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(2) allows pollutants that are limited in terms of mass to additionally be limited in terms of other units of measurement. This Order includes effluent limitations expressed in terms of mass and concentration. In addition, pursuant to the exceptions to mass limitations provided in 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1), some effluent limitations are not expressed in terms of mass, such as pH and temperature, and when the applicable standards are expressed in terms of concentration (e.g., CTR criteria and MCL's) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Mass-based effluent limitations have been established in this Order for ammonia because it is an oxygen-demanding substance. Except for ammonia, mass-based effluent limitations are not included in this Order for pollutant parameters for which effluent limitations are based on water quality objectives and criteria that are concentration-based.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the design flow (average dry weather flow) in Prohibition III.F of this Order.

2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations

40 C.F.R. section 122.45(d) requires AMEL's and AWEL's for POTW's unless impracticable. For copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc, AWEL's have been replaced with MDEL's in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. Furthermore, for pH, chlorine residual, and total coliform organisms, AWEL's have been replaced or supplemented with effluent limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. The rationale for using shorter averaging periods for these constituents is discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The CWA specifies that a revised permit may not include effluent limitations that are less stringent than the previous permit unless a less-stringent limitation is justified based on exceptions to the anti-backsliding provisions contained in CWA sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l).

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order, with the exception of effluent limitations for ammonia, BOD₅, copper, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, settleable solids, TSS, and zinc. The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in Order R5-2012-0085. This relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

- a. **CWA sections 402(o)(1) and 303(d)(4).** CWA section 402(o)(1) prohibits the establishment of less stringent WQBEL's "except in compliance with

section 303(d)(4).” CWA section 303(d)(4) has two parts: paragraph (A) which applies to nonattainment waters and paragraph (B) which applies to attainment waters.

- i. For waters where standards are not attained, CWA section 304(d)(4)(A) specifies that any effluent limit based on a TMDL or other WLA may be revised only if the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limits based on such TMDL's or WLA's will assure the attainment of such water quality standards.
- ii. For attainment waters, CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) specifies that a limitation based on a water quality standard may be relaxed where the action is consistent with the antidegradation policy.

The Sacramento River is considered an attainment water for ammonia, BOD₅, copper, dichlorobromomethane, nitrate plus nitrite, settleable solids, TSS, and zinc because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for these constituents.¹ As discussed in section IV.D.4, below, removal of the effluent limits complies with federal and state antidegradation requirements. Thus, relaxation of the effluent limitations for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc, removal of the effluent limitations for nitrate plus nitrite and settleable solids, and removal of the maximum daily and mass-based effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS from Order R5-2012-0085 meet the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

- b. **CWA section 402(o)(2).** CWA section 402(o)(2) provides several exceptions to the anti-backsliding regulations. CWA section 402(o)(2)(B)(i) allows a renewed, reissued, or modified permit to contain a less-stringent effluent limitation for a pollutant if information is available that was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and that would have justified the application of a less-stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance.

As described further in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2012-0085 was issued indicates that nitrate plus nitrite and settleable solids in the effluent do not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality objectives in the receiving water. Additionally, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2012-0085 was issued indicates that less-stringent effluent limitations for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc based on Facility performance and available dilution credits satisfy the requirements in CWA section 402(o)(2). The updated information that supports the removal of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

- i. **Ammonia.** Updated effluent data indicates that the Facility cannot consistently comply with the existing performance-based effluent limitations, and the Sacramento River has sufficient dilution and assimilative capacity available for ammonia. Therefore, this Order includes less stringent effluent limitations for ammonia based on updated Facility performance and available dilution.
- ii. **Copper.** Updated effluent data indicates that the Facility cannot consistently comply with the existing performance-based effluent limitations, and the Sacramento River has sufficient dilution and assimilative capacity available for

¹ “The exceptions in section 303(d)(4) address both waters in attainment with water quality standards and those not in attainment, i.e. waters on the section 303(d) impaired waters list.” State Water Board Order WQ 2008-0006, Berry Petroleum Company, Poso Creek/McVan Facility.

copper. Therefore, this Order includes less stringent effluent limitations for copper based on updated Facility performance and available dilution.

- iii. **Dichlorobromomethane.** Updated effluent data indicates that the Facility cannot consistently comply with the existing performance-based effluent limitations, and the Sacramento River has sufficient dilution and assimilative capacity available for dichlorobromomethane. Therefore, this Order includes less stringent effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane based on updated Facility performance and available dilution.
 - iv. **Nitrate plus Nitrite.** Effluent monitoring data collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017 indicates that nitrate plus nitrite in the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Primary MCL objective.
 - v. **Settleable Solids.** Effluent monitoring data collected during the discharge season from September 2014 through June 2017 indicates that settleable solids in the discharge does not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan objective.
 - vi. **Zinc.** Updated effluent data indicates that the Facility cannot consistently comply with the existing performance-based effluent limitations, and the Sacramento River has sufficient dilution and assimilative capacity available for zinc. Therefore, this Order includes less stringent effluent limitations for zinc based on updated Facility performance and available dilution.
- c. **Flow.** Order R5-2012-0085 included flow as an effluent limit based on the Facility design flow. In accordance with Order R5-2012-0085, compliance with the flow limit was calculated using the average daily flow over three consecutive dry weather months. Flow is not a pollutant and therefore has been changed from an effluent limit to a discharge prohibition in this Order, which is an equivalent level of regulation. This Order is not less stringent because compliance with flow as a discharge prohibition will be calculated the same way as the previous Order. Flow as a discharge prohibition adequately regulates the Facility, does not allow for an increase in the discharge of pollutants, and does not constitute backsliding.

4. Antidegradation Policies

Surface Water. The permitted surface water discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Antidegradation Policy. This Order provides for an increase in the volume and mass of pollutants discharged for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc. The increase will not have a significant impact on beneficial uses and will not cause a violation of water quality objectives. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of BPTC of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

This Order relaxes the effluent limitations for ammonia, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and zinc based on the allowance of mixing zones in accordance with the Basin Plan, the SIP, U.S. EPA's *Water Quality Standards Handbook, 2nd Edition* (updated July 2007), and the TSD. As discussed in section IV.C.2.c of this Fact Sheet, the mixing zones comply with all applicable requirements and will not be adverse to the purpose of the state and federal antidegradation policies. Furthermore, the allowance of mixing zones for ammonia, copper, and zinc will result in a minor increase in the discharge, resulting in less than 10 percent of the available assimilative capacity in the receiving water.

According to U.S. EPA's memorandum on Tier 2 Antidegradation Reviews and Significance Thresholds, any individual decision to lower water quality for non-bioaccumulative chemicals that is limited to 10 percent of the available assimilative capacity represents minimal risk to the receiving water and is fully consistent with the objectives and goals of the Clean Water Act. The Central Valley Water Board finds that any lowering of water quality outside the mixing zone for ammonia, copper, and zinc will be de minimis. Further, any change to water quality will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses and will not result in water quality less than prescribed in State Water Board policies or the Basin Plan. The measures implemented required by this Order result in the implementation of BPTC. Thus, the relaxation of the effluent limitations for ammonia, copper, and zinc, is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Antidegradation Policy.

The allowance of a mixing zone for dichlorobromomethane will result in the use of greater than 10 percent of the available assimilative capacity in the receiving water. The Discharger submitted an Antidegradation Analysis Update Study (2017 Antidegradation Update) with the ROWD in order to justify the increased discharge of dichlorobromomethane.

The 2017 Antidegradation Update assessed whether the resultant conditions of the mixing zone will continue to be protective of the beneficial uses of the Sacramento River and whether allowing the potential incremental degradation would be consistent with the maximum benefit of the people of the state, given the economic and social benefits versus the water quality impacts and the cost and feasibility of alternatives.

The 2017 Antidegradation Update provides a "simple" antidegradation analysis following the guidance in Administrative Procedures Update (APU) 90-004 based on the determination that the discharge is temporally limited, will not result in any long-term deleterious effects on water quality, and the reduction in water quality is spatially localized. Pursuant to APU 90-004, the 2017 Antidegradation Update evaluated whether changes in water quality resulting from the discharge are consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state, will not unreasonably affect beneficial uses, and will not cause water quality to be less than water quality objectives. Findings from the 2017 Antidegradation Update are summarized below.

- i. **Water quality parameters and beneficial uses that will be affected by this Order and the extent of the impact.** Compliance with this Order will not adversely impact beneficial uses of the receiving water or downstream receiving waters. All beneficial uses will be maintained and protected. 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 defines the following tier designations to describe water quality in the receiving water body.

Tier 1 Designation: Existing in-stream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected.
(40 C.F.R. § 131.12)

Tier 2 Designation: Where the quality of waters exceed levels necessary to support propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water, that quality shall be maintained and protected unless the State finds, after full satisfaction of the intergovernmental coordination and public participation provisions of the State's continuing planning process, that allowing lower water quality is necessary to accommodate important economic or social

development in the area in which the waters are located. In allowing such degradation or lower water quality, the State shall assure water quality adequate to protect existing uses fully. Further, the State shall assure that there shall be achieved the highest statutory and regulatory requirements for all new and existing point sources and all cost-effective and reasonable best management practices for nonpoint source control. (40 C.F.R. § 131.12)

The tier designation is assigned on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis. The 2017 Antidegradation Update did not delineate the tier designation for dichlorobromomethane, but instead assessed the potential lowering of the Sacramento River water quality. The Sacramento River from Box Canyon to Shasta Lake is not listed as an impaired water body on the 2014 and 2016 303(d) list; therefore, the Sacramento River is not impaired by dichlorobromomethane and is considered a Tier 2 receiving water for this pollutant.

As discussed below, the 2017 Antidegradation Update evaluated whether the allowance of an increase in dichlorobromomethane concentrations and loadings in this Order will result in the BPTC of the discharge necessary to assure a pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with the maximum benefit of the people of the state will be maintained.

- ii. **Scientific Rationale for Determining Potential Lowering of Water Quality.** The rationale used in the 2017 Antidegradation Update is based on 40 C.F.R. section 131.12, the State Antidegradation Policy, and State Water Board APU 90-004. Pursuant to APU 90-004, the 2017 Antidegradation Update provided a “simple” analysis and evaluated whether the proposed discharge will produce significant changes in water quality of the receiving water that would adversely impact beneficial uses. The relevant water quality standards are concentration-based in order to prevent exceedances of concentration-based exposure thresholds. Critical flows and representative water quality measurements are criteria-dependent (i.e., shorter representative averaging periods for acute effects as compare to long-term human health criteria).
- iii. **Alternative Control Measures.** As part of the 2017 Antidegradation Update, several alternatives were considered that would reduce or eliminate the lowering of water quality associated with the granting of the proposed dilution credits. The treatment alternatives were evaluated based on water quality, economic, implementation feasibility, and social factors. The treatment alternatives that were considered include the following:
 - (a) Higher level of treatment;
 - (b) Zero discharge;
 - (c) Flow-restricted discharge;
 - (d) Pollutant source minimization;
 - (e) Connect to a nearby wastewater stream; and
 - (f) Change in drinking water source.
- iv. **Socioeconomic Evaluation.** As part of the 2017 Antidegradation Update, the Discharger performed a socioeconomic evaluation and considered alternatives to the potential water quality impacts. The objective of the socioeconomic

analysis was to determine if the lowering of Sacramento River water quality is in the maximum benefit of the people of the state. The socioeconomic evaluation provides an in-depth analysis of 1) the social benefits and costs based on the ability to accommodate socioeconomic development in the City of Dunsmuir, 2) the magnitude of the water quality impacts, the change in water quality from existing conditions, and expected effects on beneficial uses of the Sacramento River and downstream waters, 3) the feasibility and effectiveness of reducing the lowering of water quality by implementing alternatives, and 4) the economic costs of alternatives: assessed against the current cost of allowing for dilution credits, the increased cost for ratepayers, and the magnitude of the change in ratepayer costs.

Given the current infrastructure in place, existing and future development in the City of Dunsmuir would rely on the Facility for wastewater collection, treatment, and ultimate disposal. The proposed dilution credits would not further destabilize the local economy or hinder growth. Not allowing the dilution credits, however, would have negative socioeconomic effects on the area. Should the incremental changes in the Sacramento River water quality be disallowed, such action would 1) force future developments to find alternative methods for disposing of wastewater; 2) require addition of costly plant expansions/upgrades for which the current budget does not allow and existing residents cannot afford; and 3) prohibit development within and adjacent to the Facility's service area.

As described in section IV.D.4.i, above, discharge of constituents for which dilution credits are being requested would have little to no impact on pollutant concentrations in the downstream receiving water. Additionally, planned Facility upgrades that are currently in the planning stages will allow for more consistent compliance with applicable effluent limitations.

An evaluation of several alternatives and their effects on water quality impacts and beneficial use protection did not identify any feasible alternative control measures that would more effectively accommodate the dilution credits that would result from implementing the alternative, relative to implementing the proposed dilution credits. For example, providing a higher level of treatment is the most effective alternative to prevent lowering of water quality in the Sacramento River, however, it is not as economically feasible to implement. Also, even though the Discharger is planning to complete multiple Facility upgrades, dilution credits are still necessary to provide a means of compliant sewer capacity.

In general, the cost to implement alternatives would be distributed to ratepayers based on the need to address existing water quality issues. Development that requires plant expansion would incur costs associated with additional treatment, thereby possibly prohibiting some of the socioeconomic growth within the area. Furthermore, existing residents would be forced to bear the costs associated with additional treatment and/or land disposal facilities. Not allowing for dilution credits would require additional rate increases, thereby putting a significant burden on the people of a community already disadvantaged compared to the rest of the state.

- v. **Justification of Socioeconomic Considerations.** The Discharger will continue to operate a treatment system that meets and exceeds BPTC by filtering the secondary effluent and improving effluent quality via the proposed

project. Any potential for discharges to cause additional exceedances of adopted water quality criteria/objectives would be effectively addressed through the NPDES permit renewal process, thereby being addressed in a timely manner. Thus, resulting downstream water quality within the Sacramento River would not cause a nuisance and would continue to be protective of all beneficial uses within the river, as well as uses of downstream water.

The alternatives considered within the 2017 Antidegradation Update were found to be infeasible for either cost or logistical concerns when compared to the proposed action of allowing for the proposed dilution credits. Not allowing for the dilution credits would have direct adverse socioeconomic effects with regard to the local economy and limited growth in the region, which, in turn, would adversely affect the future tax base of the community.

The 2017 Antidegradation Analysis concludes that the Facility currently operates, and will continue to operate, to meet the highest statutory and regulatory requirements, which result in the BPTC of the discharge necessary to assure that a water quality nuisance will not occur in the receiving water and beneficial uses are fully protected. The limited degradation in receiving water quality resulting from the allowance of the proposed dilution credits would accommodate important socioeconomic stability and development in the service area while maintaining full protection of the beneficial uses of the Sacramento River.

The Central Valley Water Board concurs with the findings of the 2017 Antidegradation Update and finds that the discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Antidegradation Policy. Compliance with these requirements will result in the BPTC of discharges from the Facility. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

This Order removes effluent limitations for nitrate plus nitrite and settleable solids based on updated information, as described further in sections IV.C.3 and IV.D.3 of this Fact Sheet. The removal of effluent limitations for nitrate plus nitrite and settleable solids will not result in a decrease in the level of treatment or control, or a reduction in water quality. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the removal of the effluent limitations for nitrate plus nitrite and settleable solids does not result in an allowed increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving water. Thus, the relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Antidegradation Policy.

This Order also removes MDEL's and mass-based effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS based on 40 C.F.R part 122.45(d) and (f), and as described further in section IV.D.3 of this Fact Sheet. The removal of MDEL's and mass-based effluent limits for BOD₅ and TSS will not result in a decrease in the level of treatment or control, or a reduction in water quality because the WQBEL's for BOD₅ and TSS are based on the technical capability of the treatment process to meet Title 22, or equivalent, disinfection requirements required to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters. This is unchanged from the previous permit. Furthermore, both concentration-based AMEL's and AWEL's remain for BOD₅ and TSS, as well as an average dry weather discharge flow prohibition that limits the amount of flow that can be discharged daily. The

combination of concentration-based effluent limits and a flow prohibition in this Order are equivalent to mass-based effluent limitations, which were redundant limits contained in previous Orders by multiplying the concentration-based effluent limits and permitted average dry weather flow by a conversion factor to determine the mass-based effluent limitations. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the removal of MDEL's and mass-based effluent limits for BOD₅ and TSS does not result in an allowed increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving waters. Thus, the relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Antidegradation Policy.

- d. **Groundwater.** The Discharger utilizes network of five percolation ponds. Domestic wastewater contains constituents such as BOD₅, electrical conductivity, metals, nitrate, organics, pathogens, and total dissolved solids. Percolation from the ponds may result in an increase in the concentration of these constituents in the groundwater. The increase in the concentration of these constituents in the groundwater must be consistent with the State Antidegradation Policy. Any increase in pollutant concentrations in the groundwater must be shown to be necessary to allow wastewater utility service necessary to accommodate housing and economic expansion in the area and must be consistent with the maximum benefit of the people of the state. Some degradation of groundwater by the Discharger is consistent with the State Antidegradation Policy provided that:
- i. The degradation is limited in extent;
 - ii. The degradation after effective source control, treatment, and control is limited to waste constituent typically encountered in municipal wastewater as specified in the groundwater limitations in this Order;
 - iii. The Discharger minimizes degradation by fully implementing, regularly maintaining, and optimally operating BPTC measures; and
 - iv. The degradation does not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the Basin Plan.

Groundwater limitations for total coliform organisms and nitrate nitrogen (as N) have been included in this Order for the protection of the MUN beneficial use of the groundwater.

5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBEL's for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD₅, pH, and TSS. Restrictions on these constituents are discussed in section IV.B.2 of this Fact Sheet. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. For BOD₅, pH, and TSS, both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBEL's are applicable. The more stringent of these effluent limitations are implemented by this Order. These limitations are not more stringent than required by the CWA.

WQBEL's have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant WQBEL's were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The procedures for calculating the individual WQBEL's for priority pollutants are based on the CTR implemented by the

SIP, which was approved by U.S. EPA on 18 May 2000. Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

**Summary of Final Effluent Limitations
Discharge Point 001**

Table F-18. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis ¹
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Conventional Pollutants							
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--	TTC
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	CFR
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.0	BP
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	--	--	--	TTC
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	CFR
Priority Pollutants							
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	29	--	54	--	--	CTR
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	25	--	72	--	--	CTR
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	81	--	140	--	--	CTR
Non-Conventional Pollutants							
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	22	45	--	--	--	NAWQC
	lbs/day ²	55	110	--	--	--	
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.011 ³	0.019 ⁴	--	--	NAWQC
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL ⁵	--	23 ⁶	240 ⁷	--	--	DDW
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL ⁸	--	2.2 ⁶	23 ⁷	--	240	Title 22
Acute Toxicity	% survival	--	--	70 ⁹ /90 ¹⁰	--	--	BP

¹ TTC – Based on tertiary treatment capability. These effluent limitations reflect the capability of a properly operated tertiary treatment plant.

CFR – Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 C.F.R part 133.

BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.

CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.

NAWQC – Based on U.S. EPA's National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

MCL – Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.

DDW – Pursuant to guidance from DDW.

Title 22 – Based on CA Division of Drinking Water Reclamation Criteria, CCR, division 4, chapter 3.

² Based on an average dry weather flow of 0.30 MGD.

³ Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.

⁴ Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.

⁵ Applicable for discharges from 16 November through 30 April.

⁶ Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.

⁷ Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

⁸ Applicable for discharges from 1 May through 14 June and 16 September through 15 November.

⁹ 70% minimum of any one bioassay.

¹⁰ 90% median for any three consecutive bioassays.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

F. Land Discharge Specifications

1. The Land Discharge Specifications are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the groundwater.
2. Anaerobic (lacking in oxygen) processes tend to produce aesthetically undesirable odors. To minimize the production of undesirable odors, the Discharger is required to maintain some (at least 1.0 mg/L) dissolved oxygen in the upper one foot of the pond.
3. **Daily Average Discharge Specification.** The discharge specification is based on the percolation pond average dry weather flow capacity of 0.30 MGD.

G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water

1. CWA section 303(a-c) requires states to adopt water quality standards, including criteria, where they are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Central Valley Water Board adopted water quality criteria as water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan states that “[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Water Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains receiving surface water limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for bacteria, biostimulatory substances, color, chemical constituents, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, suspended sediment, settleable substances, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity.

B. Groundwater

1. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are MUN, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, and agricultural supply.
2. Basin Plan water quality objectives include narrative objectives for chemical constituents, tastes and odors, and toxicity of groundwater. The toxicity objective requires that groundwater be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in humans, plants, animals, or aquatic life. The chemical constituent objective states groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect any beneficial use. The tastes and odors objective prohibits taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan also establishes numerical water quality objectives for chemical constituents and radioactivity in groundwaters designated with the MUN beneficial use. These include, at a minimum, compliance with MCL's in Title 22 of the CCR. The bacteria objective prohibits coliform organisms at or above 2.2 MPN/100 mL. The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that waters do not contain chemical constituents, toxic substances, radionuclides, taste- or odor-producing substances, or bacteria in concentrations that adversely affect municipal or domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial supply or some other beneficial use.
3. Groundwater limitations are required to protect the beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater.

VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The Discharger must comply with all Standard Provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under 40 C.F.R. section 122.42.

Sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) of 40 C.F.R. establish conditions that apply to all state-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. Section 123.25(a)(12) of 40 C.F.R. allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the Water Code is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference Water Code section 13387(e).

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Mercury.** This provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order in the event mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted. In addition, this Order may be reopened if the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to NPDES permits.
- b. **Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a site-specific Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) or, under certain circumstances, the Discharger may be allowed to participate in an approved Toxicity Evaluation Study (TES) in lieu of conducting a site-specific TRE. This Order may be reopened to include a new chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE and/or TES.
- c. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WER's and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- d. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013, the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2013-0098, amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking Water Policy. The State Water Board approved the Drinking Water Policy on 3 December 2013. This Order may be reopened to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.
- e. **Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS).** On 31 May 2018, as part of the CV-SALTS initiative, the Central Valley Water Board approved Basin Plan Amendments to incorporate new strategies for addressing ongoing salt and nitrate accumulation in the Central Valley. If approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and U.S. EPA, the Amendments

would impose certain new requirements on salt and nitrate discharges. If the Amendments ultimately go into effect, this Order may be amended or modified to incorporate any newly-applicable requirements.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements


- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) Based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from September 2014 through June 2017, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

The MRP of this Order requires chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. If the discharge exceeds the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger, this provision requires the Discharger either participate in an approved TES or conduct a site-specific TRE.

A TES may be conducted in lieu of a TRE if the percent effect at 100 percent effluent is less than or equal to 50 percent. Determining the cause of toxicity can be challenging when the toxicity signal is low. Several Central Valley facilities with similar treatment systems have been experiencing intermittent low-level toxicity. The dischargers have not been successful identifying the cause of the toxicity because of the low toxicity signal and the intermittent nature of the toxicity. Due to these challenges, CVCWA, in collaboration with staff from the Central Valley Water Board, has initiated a Special Study to Investigate Low Level Toxicity Indications (Group Toxicity Study). This Order allows the Discharger to participate in an approved TES, which may be conducted individually or as part of a coordinated group effort with other similar dischargers that are exhibiting toxicity. Although the current CVCWA Group Toxicity Study is related to low-level toxicity, participation in an approved TES is not limited to only low-level toxicity issues.

See the WET Monitoring Flow Chart (Figure F-2), below, for further clarification of the decision points for determining the need for TES/TRE initiation.

Figure F-2
WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart



¹ The Discharger shall participate in an approved TES if the discharge has exceeded the chronic toxicity monitoring trigger twice or more in the past 12-month period and the cause is not identified and/or addressed.

² The Discharger may elect to take additional samples to determine the 3-sample median. The samples shall be collected at least one week apart and the final sample shall be within 6 weeks of the initial sample exhibiting toxicity.

³ The Discharger may participate in an approved TES instead of a TRE if the Discharger has conducted a TRE within the past 12 months and has been unsuccessful in identifying the toxicant.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** An evaluation and minimization plan for salinity is required to be maintained in this Order to ensure adequate measures are developed and implemented by the Discharger to reduce the discharge of salinity to the Sacramento River.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

a. Percolation Pond Operating Requirements

- i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
- ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
- iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,
 - (a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface;
 - (b) Weeds shall be minimized; and
 - (c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
- iv. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- v. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary I&I during the non-irrigation season.
- vi. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with the Land Discharge Specifications in section IV.B of the Order.

5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW's)

- a. **Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications.** Sludge in this Order means the solid, semisolid, and liquid residues removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment processes. Solid waste refers to grit and screening material generated during preliminary treatment. Residual sludge means sludge that will not be subject to further treatment at the Facility. Biosolids refer to sludge that has been treated and tested and shown to be capable of being beneficially and legally used pursuant to federal and state regulations as a soil amendment for agricultural, silvicultural, horticultural, and land reclamation activities as specified under 40 C.F.R. part 503. This Order does not regulate off-site use or disposal of biosolids, which are regulated instead under 40 C.F.R. part 503; administered by U.S. EPA. The Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications in this Order implement the California Water Code to ensure sludge/biosolids are properly handled on-site to prevent nuisance, protect public health, and protect groundwater quality.
- b. **Continuous Monitoring Systems.** This Order, and the MRP that is a part of this Order, require that certain parameters be monitored on a continuous basis. The Facility is not staffed 24 hours a day. Permit violations or system upsets can go undetected during this period. The Discharger has a system in place to

automatically contact Facility operators in the event alarms are generated at the Facility. The Discharger is required to establish an electronic system for operator notification based on continuous recording device alarms. For any future Facility upgrades, the Discharger shall upgrade the continuous monitoring and notification system simultaneously.

6. Other Special Provisions – Not Applicable

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The MRP, Attachment E of this Order, establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this Facility.

A. Influent Monitoring

1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (e.g., BOD₅ and TSS reduction requirements). The monitoring frequencies for flow (continuous), BOD₅ (weekly), and TSS (weekly) have been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.
2. Order R5-2012-0085 required weekly influent mass calculations for BOD₅ and TSS. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that influent mass calculations for BOD₅ and TSS are not necessary to determine compliance with conditions established in this Order. Thus, influent mass calculation requirements for BOD₅ and TSS have not been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.
3. Order R5-2012-0085 required daily influent monitoring for pH. This Order reduces the monitoring frequency for pH from daily to three times per week. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient for characterizing the wastewater and assessing compliance with effluent limitations established in this Order.

B. Effluent Monitoring

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(i)(2), effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations or discharge prohibitions. Effluent monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with effluent limitations and discharge prohibitions, assess the effectiveness of the treatment process, and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream and groundwater.
2. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (continuous), BOD₅ (weekly), TSS (weekly), copper (monthly), dichlorobromomethane (monthly), zinc (monthly), alkalinity (monthly), chlorine residual (continuous), electrical conductivity (monthly), hardness (monthly), standard minerals (annually), temperature (twice per month), total coliform organisms (weekly), total dissolved solids (annually) and turbidity (twice per month) have been retained from Order R5-2012-0085 to determine compliance with effluent limitations and discharge prohibitions for these parameters.
3. Order R5-2012-0085 required weekly effluent mass calculations for BOD₅ and TSS. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that effluent mass calculations for BOD₅ and TSS are not necessary to determine compliance with conditions established in this

Order. Thus, effluent mass calculation requirements for BOD₅ and TSS have not been retained from Order R5-2012-0085

4. Monitoring data collected over the previous permit term for arsenic, carbon tetrachloride, heptachlor, chloride, nitrate, nitrite, settleable solids, and sulfate did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.
5. Order R5-2012-0085 required daily effluent monitoring for pH. This Order reduces the monitoring frequency for pH from daily to three times per week. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient for characterizing the wastewater and assessing compliance with effluent limitations established in this Order.
6. Order R5-2012-0085 required monthly effluent monitoring for ammonia. This Order increases the monitoring frequency for ammonia from monthly to twice per month. Additionally, this Order requires mass calculations for ammonia to determine compliance with mass-based effluent limitations for this oxygen-demanding substance. The Central Valley Water Board finds that these monitoring requirements are sufficient for characterizing the wastewater and assessing compliance with effluent limitations established in this Order.
7. In accordance with section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring is required for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires effluent monitoring for priority pollutants and other constituents of concern semi-annually during the year 2020. This monitoring frequency has been retained from Order R5-2012-0085. See section IX.D of the MRP (Attachment E) for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.
8. Water Code section 13176, subdivision (a), states: *"The analysis of any material required by [Water Code sections 13000-16104] shall be performed by a laboratory that has accreditation or certification pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with section 100825) of chapter 4 of part 1 of division 101 of the Health and Safety Code."* DDW accredits laboratories through its Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

Section 13176 cannot be interpreted in a manner that would violate federal holding time requirements that apply to NPDES permits pursuant to the CWA (Wat. Code §§ 13370, subd. (c), 13372, 13377). Section 13176 is inapplicable to NPDES permits to the extent it is inconsistent with CWA requirements (Wat. Code § 13372, subd. (a)). The holding time requirements are 15 minutes for chlorine residual, dissolved oxygen, and pH, and immediate analysis is required for temperature (40 C.F.R. § 136.3(e), Table II). Due to the location of the Facility, it is both legally and factually impossible for the Discharger to comply with section 13176 for constituents with short holding times.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Consistent with Order R5-2012-0085, semi-annual 96-hour bioassay testing is required, when discharging to surface water, to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Order R5-2012-0085 required annual chronic WET testing between 16 September and 15 October. This Order requires annual chronic WET testing within 30 days of commencing discharges to surface waters. The Central Valley Water Board finds that these chronic WET testing requirements are sufficient for characterizing the wastewater and assessing compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring

1. Surface Water

- a. Receiving water monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.
- b. Receiving water monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (daily), pH (weekly), copper (semi-annually), dichlorobromomethane (semi-annually), zinc (semi-annually), ammonia (annually), dissolved oxygen (weekly), electrical conductivity (weekly), hardness (monthly), standard minerals (annually), temperature (weekly), total coliform organisms (semi-annually), total dissolved solids (annually), and turbidity (semi-annually) at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002 have been retained from Order R5-2012-0085 to characterize the receiving water for these parameters.
- c. Monitoring data collected over the previous permit term for arsenic, carbon tetrachloride, heptachlor, nitrate, nitrite, and sulfate, did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific receiving water monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.
- d. In accordance with section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring is required for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires upstream receiving water monitoring for priority pollutants and other pollutants of concern at Monitoring Location RSW-001 semi-annually during the year 2020, concurrent with effluent monitoring, in order to collect data to conduct an RPA for the next permit renewal. See section IX.D of the MRP (Attachment E) for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.

2. Groundwater

- a. Water Code section 13267 states, in part, “(a) A *Regional Water Board, in establishing...waste discharge requirements... may investigate the quality of any waters of the state within its region*” and “(b) (1) *In conducting an investigation..., the Regional Water Board may require that any person who... discharges... waste...that could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the Regional Water Board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports.*” The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, a Regional Water Board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports. The MRP is issued pursuant to Water Code section 13267. The groundwater monitoring and reporting program required by this Order and the MRP are necessary to assure compliance with these WDR's. The Discharger is responsible for the discharges of waste at the Facility subject to this Order.
- b. Monitoring of the groundwater must be conducted to determine if the discharge has caused an increase in constituent concentrations, when compared to background. The monitoring must, at a minimum, require a complete assessment of groundwater impacts including the vertical and lateral extent of degradation, an assessment of all wastewater-related constituents that may have migrated to groundwater, and an

analysis of whether additional or different methods of treatment or control of the discharge are necessary to provide BPTC to comply with the State Antidegradation Policy. Economic analysis is only one of many factors considered in determining BPTC. If monitoring indicates that the discharge has incrementally increased constituent concentrations in groundwater above background, this permit may be reopened and modified. Until groundwater monitoring is sufficient, this Order contains Groundwater Limitations that allow groundwater quality to be degraded for certain constituents when compared to background groundwater quality, but not to exceed water quality objectives. If groundwater quality has been degraded by the discharge, the incremental change in pollutant concentration (when compared with background) may not be increased. If groundwater quality has been or may be degraded by the discharge, this Order may be reopened and specific numeric limitations established consistent with the State Antidegradation Policy and the Basin Plan.

- c. Order R5-2012-0085 required regular monitoring of groundwater wells RGW-001 through RGW-010. This Order removes the monitoring of groundwater wells RGW-002 and RGW-008 because Facility upgrades have rendered these wells inoperable. This Order requires the Discharger to continue groundwater monitoring of wells RGW-004, RGW-005, RGW-006, and RGW-010, and retains the regular schedule of groundwater monitoring in the attached MRP. This Order retains measurement of depth to groundwater and discontinues all other regular groundwater monitoring parameters for wells RGW-001, RGW-003, RGW-007, and RGW-009, because monitoring of these wells for the full list of parameters is not necessary to determine whether the Facility is impacting groundwater. The groundwater monitoring reports are necessary to evaluate impacts to waters of the state to assure protection of beneficial uses and compliance with Central Valley Water Board plans and policies, including the State Antidegradation Policy. Evidence in the record includes effluent monitoring data that indicates the presence of constituents that may degrade groundwater and surface water.

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Biosolids Monitoring

Biosolids monitoring for compliance with 40 C.F.R. part 503 regulations is not included in this Order since it is a program administered by U.S. EPA's part 503 biosolids program:

<https://www.epa.gov/biosolids/compliance-and-annual-reporting-guidance-about-clean-water-act-laws>

2. Water Supply Monitoring

- a. Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater. Consistent with Order R5-2012-0085, this Order requires annual water supply monitoring for electrical conductivity, standard minerals, and total dissolved solids at Monitoring Location SPL-001.
- b. Order R5-2012-0085 required annual water supply monitoring for copper and zinc. The Central Valley Water Board finds that water supply monitoring for copper and zinc is not necessary; thus, water supply monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.

3. Percolation Pond Monitoring

- a. Percolation pond monitoring is required to ensure proper operation of the storage ponds. Monitoring frequencies for freeboard (daily), dissolved oxygen (weekly),

levee condition (weekly), color (weekly), and odor (weekly) have been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.

4. Land Discharge Monitoring

- a. Land discharge monitoring is required to ensure that the discharge to the percolation ponds complies with the land discharge specifications in section IV.B of this Order. Monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (continuous), BOD₅ (weekly), TSS (weekly), chloride (annually), iron (annually), manganese (annually), electrical conductivity (monthly), hardness (monthly), nitrate (monthly), total coliform organisms (weekly), and total dissolved solids (annually) have been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.
- b. Monitoring data collected over the previous permit term for settleable solids and sulfate did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, land discharge monitoring requirements for settleable solids and sulfate have not been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.

5. French Drain and Subsurface Drain Monitoring

- a. Order R5-2012-0085 required monthly monitoring for total coliform organisms and fecal coliform organisms within the French Drain and Subsurface Drain at Monitoring Locations FD-001 and SD-001, respectively. Within the ROWD, the Discharger requested that specific monitoring requirements at Monitoring Locations FD-001 and SD-001 not be retained from Order R5-2012-0085, since the French Drain and Subsurface Drain are subject to off-site sources of contamination and are not representative of wastewater from the Facility. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for fecal coliform organisms and total coliform organisms at Monitoring Locations FD-001 and SD-001 have not been retained from Order R5-2012-0085.

6. Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program

Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), U.S. EPA requires all dischargers under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by U.S. EPA to the State Water Board, the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from their own laboratories or their contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall submit annually the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to U.S. EPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Central Valley Water Board has considered the issuance of WDR's that will serve as an NPDES permit for the City of Dunsmuir, Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Central Valley Water Board staff has developed tentative WDR's and has encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Persons

The Central Valley Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the posting of the Notice of Public Hearing at the Dunsmuir City Hall, the Dunsmuir Post Office, and the public entrance to the Facility on 17 September 2018. The Notice of Public Hearing was also posted on the Central Valley Water Board's website.

The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Central Valley Water Board's website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_info/meetings/

B. Written Comments

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDR's as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Central Valley Water Board at the address on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Central Valley Water Board, the written comments were due at the Central Valley Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on 15 October 2018.

C. Public Hearing

The Central Valley Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative WDR's during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: 7 December 2018
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Central Valley Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDR's, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements

Any person aggrieved by this action of the Central Valley Water Board may petition the State Water Board to review the action in accordance with Water Code section 13320 and CCR, Title 23, sections 2050 and following. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., within 30 calendar days of the date of adoption of this Order at the following address, except that if the 30th day following the date of this Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day:

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

Or by email at waterqualitypetitions@waterboards.ca.gov

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

E. Information and Copying

The ROWD, other supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Central Valley Water Board by calling (916) 464-3291.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDR's and NPDES permit should contact the Central Valley Water Board, reference this Facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to David Kirn at (916) 464-4761.

G.

ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	28.2	<0.010	5.62	5.62 ¹	3.18 ²	--	--	--	--	Yes
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	<1.0	<1.1	1.8	--	--	1.8	5.9	--	6.0	No ³
Chloride	mg/L	71.2	1.23	230	860 ¹	230 ⁴	--	--	--	250	No
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	20.6	1.1	4.6	6.5	4.6	1,300	--	6.4	1,000	Yes
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	4.56	<0.080	0.56	--	--	0.56	46	--	80	Yes
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	375 ⁵	89 ⁵	900	--	--	--	--	--	900	No
Nitrate, Total (as N)	mg/L	6.74	<0.020	10	--	--	--	--	--	10	No
Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.074	<0.010	1.0	--	--	--	--	--	1.0	No
Sulfate	mg/L	18 ⁵	1.5 ⁵	250	--	--	--	--	--	250	No
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	235 ⁵	55 ⁵	500	--	--	--	--	--	500	No
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	69.8	0.80	18	60	60	--	--	18	5,000	Yes

General Note: All inorganic concentrations are given as a total recoverable.

MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration

B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect

C = Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)

Water & Org = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)

Org. Only = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)

Basin Plan = Numeric Site-specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective

MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level

Footnotes:

- (1) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 1-hour average.
- (2) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 30-day average.
- (3) See section IV.C.3 of the Fact Sheet for a discussion of the RPA results.
- (4) U.S. EPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 4-day average.
- (5) Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison with the MCL.

H.

ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBEL'S

Human Health WQBEL's Calculations										
Parameter	Units	Criteria	Mean Background Concentration	CV Eff ¹	Dilution Factor	MDEL/AMEL Multiplier	AMEL Multiplier	AMEL	MDEL	AWEL
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	<0.080	1.64	49.9	2.95	2.52	25	72	--

¹ Coefficient of Variation (CV) was established in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP.

Aquatic Life WQBEL's Calculations																
Parameter	Units	Criteria		B	Dilution Factors		Aquatic Life Calculations							Final Effluent Limitations		
		CMC	CCC		CMC	CCC	ECA Multiplier ^{acute}	LTA ^{acute}	ECA Multiplier ^{chronic}	LTA ^{chronic}	AMEL Multiplier ⁹⁵	AWEL Multiplier	MDEL Multiplier ⁹⁹	AMEL ²	AWEL ³	MDEL ⁴
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	5.62	3.18	<0.010	9	14	0.20	11	0.67	32 ⁵	1.95 ⁵	3.91	--	22	45	--
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	6.4 ⁶	4.6	1.1	9	14	0.36	19	0.56	30	1.48	--	2.82	29	--	54
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	60 ⁶	60	1.2	7.4	0.57	0.41	58	0.62	58	1.40	--	2.43	81	--	140

¹ CV was established in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP.

² Average Monthly Effluent Limitations are calculated according to section 1.4 of the SIP using a 95th percentile occurrence probability.

³ Average Weekly Effluent Limitations are calculated according to section 1.4 of the SIP using a 98th percentile occurrence probability.

⁴ Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations are calculated according to section 1.4 of the SIP using a 99th percentile occurrence probability.

⁵ The LTA and AMEL multiplier corresponding to the 30-day CCC was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period and a monthly sampling frequency (n) of 30.

⁶ CMC replaced with more stringent Basin Plan maximum concentration objective.