

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD**

**CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

415 Knollcrest Drive, Suite 100, Redding, CA 96002  
Phone (530) 224-4845 • FAX (530) 224-4857  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

**ORDER NO. R5-2007-XXXX**  
**NPDES NO. CA0077704**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
CITY OF ANDERSON  
ANDERSON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT  
SHASTA COUNTY**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 1. Discharger Information**

<b>Discharger</b>	City of Anderson
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant
<b>Facility Address</b>	3701 Rupert Road
	Anderson, CA 96007
	Shasta County
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board have classified this discharge as a <b>major</b> discharge.	

The discharge by the City of Anderson from the discharge points identified below is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 2. Discharge Location**

<b>Discharge Point</b>	<b>Effluent Description</b>	<b>Discharge Point Latitude</b>	<b>Discharge Point Longitude</b>	<b>Receiving Water</b>
D-001	Advanced Secondary Treated Wastewater	40° 28' 8" N	122° 16' 45" W	Sacramento River

**Table 3. Administrative Information**

This Order was adopted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board on:	<b>XX December 2007</b>
This Order shall become effective on:	<b>Effective Date</b>
This Order shall expire on:	<b>Expiration Date</b>
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements no later than:	<b>180 days prior to the Order expiration date</b>

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Order No. **R5-2001-0195** is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code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 federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order.

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **XX December 2007**.

---

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

### Table of Contents

I.	Facility Information .....	3
II.	Findings .....	3
III.	Discharge Prohibitions.....	9
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications .....	10
	A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001.....	10
	1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001.....	10
	2. Interim Effluent Limitations- Not Applicable .....	11
	B. Land Discharge Specifications – Emergency Storage Pond.....	11
	C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable .....	12
V.	Receiving Water Limitations .....	12
	A. Surface Water Limitations.....	12
	B. Groundwater Limitations .....	14
VI.	Provisions .....	15
	A. Standard Provisions.....	15
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements .....	19
	C. Special Provisions.....	19
	1. Reopener Provisions .....	19
	2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements .....	21
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention .....	23
	4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications .....	24
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only).....	25
	6. Other Special Provisions .....	28
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable.....	29
VII.	Compliance Determination .....	29

### List of Tables

Table 1.	Discharger Information .....	Cover
Table 2.	Discharge Location .....	Cover
Table 3.	Administrative Information .....	Cover
Table 4.	Facility Information.....	3
Table 5.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses.....	5
Table 6.	Effluent Limitations .....	10

### List of Attachments

Attachment A – Definitions .....	A-1
Attachment B – Map .....	B-1
Attachment C – Aerial Photograph .....	C-1
Attachment D – Standard Provisions.....	D-1
Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP).....	E-1
Attachment F – Fact Sheet.....	F-1

**I. FACILITY INFORMATION**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements as set forth in this Order:

**Table 4. Facility Information**

<b>Discharger</b>	City of Anderson
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant
<b>Facility Address</b>	3701 Rupert Road
	Anderson, CA 96007
	Shasta County
<b>Facility Contact, Title, and Phone</b>	Robert Berry, Chief Plant Operator, (530) 378-6665
<b>Mailing Address</b>	1887 Howard Street, Anderson, CA 96007
<b>Type of Facility</b>	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
<b>Facility Design Flow</b>	2.0 million gallons per day (mgd)

**II. FINDINGS**

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

**A. Background.** The City of Anderson (hereinafter Discharger) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. R5-2001-0195 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0077704. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated 29 December 2005, and applied for a NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to an average monthly dry weather flow of 2.0 mgd of treated domestic wastewater (advanced secondary treatment) from the Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant, hereinafter Facility. The application was deemed complete on 28 January 2006.

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. Facility Description.** The Discharger owns and operates a Publicly Owned Treatment Works. The treatment system consists of influent pump station, bar screens, complete mix activated sludge with secondary clarification, followed by dual media pressure filtration, followed by disinfection using chlorine, and dechlorination using sulfur dioxide. The Facility also has a 3.0 million-gallon emergency storage basin. Solids handling processes include aerobic digestion of waste activated sludge followed by humus pond storage for stabilization and solar drying on sand drying beds. Wastewater is discharged through a diffuser from Discharge D-001 (see table on cover page) to the Sacramento River, a water of the United States, within the Sacramento River Watershed. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides an aerial photo of the Facility.

- C. Legal Authorities.** This Order is issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters. This Order also serves as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13260).
- D. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Regional 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 Order requirements, is hereby incorporated into this Order and constitutes part of the Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E are also incorporated into this Order.
- E. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21100-21177.
- F. Technology-based Effluent Limitations.** Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing USEPA permit regulations at section 122.44, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)<sup>1</sup> 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 Part 133 and Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) in accordance with Part 125, section 125.3. A detailed discussion of the technology-based effluent limitations development is included in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F).
- G. Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations.** Section 301(b) of the CWA and 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 a technology equivalence requirement, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC Section 13241 in establishing these requirements. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of advanced secondary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) mandates 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,

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations unless otherwise indicated.

water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) must be established using: (1) 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 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

**H. Water Quality Control Plans.** The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised February 2007), 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. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Beneficial uses applicable to the Sacramento River (from Shasta Dam to Colusa Basin Drain) are as follows: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply, including stock watering; industrial service supply; hydropower generation; water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting; non-contact water recreation, including aesthetic enjoyment; commercial and sport fishing; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; warm migration of aquatic organisms; cold migration of aquatic organisms; warm spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; cold spawning, reproduction, and /or early development; wildlife habitat; and navigation.

**Table 5. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses**

<b>Discharge Point</b>	<b>Receiving Water Name</b>	<b>Beneficial Use(s)</b>
D-001	Sacramento River (from Shasta Dam to Colusa Basin Drain)	<u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN), agricultural supply and stock watering (AGR), industrial service supply and power (IND), contact (REC-1) and non-contact (REC-2) water recreation, warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); migration (MGR); spawning (SPWN), wildlife habitat (WILD), and navigation (NAV).

The Basin Plan includes a list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), 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 CFR 130, et seq.)*.” The Basin Plan also states, “*Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to WQLSs. 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 Keswick Dam to Cottonwood Creek has been listed as an impaired waterbody pursuant to Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act for cadmium, copper, zinc, and unknown toxicity. The listing for the metals is mainly a result of long term affects of mining operations at Iron Mountain Mine (located along this

reach of river) in addition to other mines upstream of Shasta Dam. The listing for unknown toxicity has a proposed TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) completion date of 2019.

In April 2002, the Regional Board published the *Upper Sacramento River TMDL for Cadmium, Copper, and Zinc* final report. Proposed numeric acute and chronic targets for dissolved cadmium, copper, and zinc were issued as part of a TMDL program. Due to the proposed remedial activities scheduled for Iron Mountain Mine and other mine sites during the next five years, Regional Board staff proposed a 5-year TMDL water management strategy that included monitoring by NPDES-permitted dischargers for dissolved cadmium, copper, and zinc, and flow to quantify their dissolved metal loads. Review of ambient metal concentration data collected by staff, other agencies, and dischargers will allow for the determination of whether the upstream remediation efforts enable dissolved metal concentrations in the Sacramento River water to comply with the proposed targets. A review of the TMDL along with USEPA's 5-year review for the Iron Mountain Mine site is scheduled for 2008.

- I. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** USEPA adopted the NTR on December 22, 1992, and later amended it on May 4, 1995 and November 9, 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On May 18, 2000, USEPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on February 13, 2001. These rules contain water quality criteria for priority pollutants.
- J. **State Implementation Policy.** On March 2, 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 April 28, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on May 18, 2000 with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the USEPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on February 24, 2005 that became effective on July 13, 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.
- K. **Compliance Schedules and Interim Requirements.** In general, an NPDES permit must include final effluent limitations that are consistent with Clean Water Act section 301 and with 40 CFR 122.44(d). There are exceptions to this general rule. The State Water Board has concluded that where the Regional Water Board's Basin Plan allows for schedules of compliance and the Regional Water Board is newly interpreting a narrative standard, it may include schedules of compliance in the permit to meet effluent limits that implement a narrative standard. See *In the Matter of Waste Discharge Requirements for Avon Refinery* (State Board Order WQ 2001-06 at pp. 53-55). See also *Communities for a Better Environment et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board*, 34 Cal.Rptr.3d 396, 410 (2005). The Basin Plan for the Sacramento and San

Joaquin Rivers includes a provision that authorizes the use of compliance schedules in NPDES permits for water quality objectives that are adopted after the date of adoption of the Basin Plan, which was September 25, 1995 (See Basin Plan at page IV-16). Consistent with the State Water Board's Order in the CBE matter, the Regional Water Board has the discretion to include compliance schedules in NPDES permits when it is including an effluent limitation that is a "new interpretation" of a narrative water quality objective. This conclusion is also consistent with the United States Environmental Protection Agency policies and administrative decisions. See, e.g., Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) Control Policy. The Regional Water Board, however, is not required to include a schedule of compliance, but may issue a Time Schedule Order pursuant to Water Code section 13300 or a Cease and Desist Order pursuant to Water Code section 13301 where it finds that the discharger is violating or threatening to violate the permit. The Regional Water Board will consider the merits of each case in determining whether it is appropriate to include a compliance schedule in a permit, and, consistent with the Basin Plan, should consider feasibility of achieving compliance, and must impose a schedule that is as short as practicable to achieve compliance with the objectives, criteria, or effluent limit based on the objective or criteria.

For CTR constituents, Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that, based on a Discharger's request and demonstration that it is infeasible for an existing Discharger to achieve immediate compliance with an effluent limitation derived from a CTR criterion, compliance schedules may be allowed in an NPDES permit. Unless an exception has been granted under section 5.3 of the SIP, a compliance schedule may not exceed 5 years from the date that the permit is issued or reissued, nor may it extend beyond 10 years from the effective date of the SIP (or May 18, 2010) to establish and comply with CTR criterion-based effluent limitations. Where a compliance schedule for a final effluent limitation that exceeds one year, the Order must include interim numeric limitations for that constituent or parameter. Where allowed by the Basin Plan, compliance schedules and interim effluent limitations or discharge specifications may also be granted to allow time to implement a new or revised water quality objective.

- L. Alaska Rule.** On March 30, 2000, USEPA revised its regulation that specifies when new and revised state and tribal water quality standards (WQS) become effective for CWA purposes (40 C.F.R. § 131.21; 65 Fed. Reg. 24641 (April 27, 2000)). Under the revised regulation (also known as the Alaska rule), new and revised standards submitted to USEPA after May 30, 2000, must be approved by USEPA before being used for CWA purposes. The final rule also provides that standards already in effect and submitted to USEPA by May 30, 2000 may be used for CWA purposes, whether or not approved by USEPA.
  
- M. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.** This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, and pH. The water quality-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on pathogens and priority toxic pollutants. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based

requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards. These limitations are more stringent than required by the CWA. Specifically, this Order includes effluent limitations for BOD and TSS that are more stringent than applicable federal standards, but that are nonetheless necessary to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses. The rationale for including these limitations is explained in the Fact Sheet. In addition, the Regional Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically 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 water quality-based effluent limitations were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.38. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the CTR-SIP, which was approved by USEPA on May 1, 2001. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "*applicable water quality standards for purposes of the [Clean Water] Act*" pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the technology-based requirements of the CWA and the applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA.

- N. Antidegradation Policy.** 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 No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 is consistent with the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the state and federal antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet the permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provision of section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.
- O. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at title 40, Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed. All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order.
- P. Monitoring and Reporting.** Section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and

reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. This Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.

- Q. Standard and Special Provisions.** Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 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 section 122.42. The Regional Water Board has also included in this Order special provisions applicable to the Discharger. A rationale for the special provisions contained in this Order is provided in the attached Fact Sheet.
- R. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, and V.B of this Order 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.
- S. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe Waste Discharge Requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of notification are provided in the Fact Sheet of this Order.
- T. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Regional 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 of this Order.

### III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A. Discharge of wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in the Findings is prohibited.
- B. The by-pass 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 California Water Code.
- D. The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the collection, treatment, and disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.
- E. The discharge of waste that causes violation of any narrative water quality objective contained in the Basin Plan is prohibited.

- F. The discharge of waste that causes violation of any numeric water quality objective contained in the Basin Plan is prohibited.
- G. Where any numeric or narrative water quality objective contained in the Basin Plan is already being violated, the discharge of waste that causes further degradation or pollution is prohibited.
- H. The Discharger shall not cause pollution as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.
- I. The discharge of industrial storm water off-site is not authorized by this Order.

**IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS**

**A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001**

**1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001**

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point D-001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the attached MRP (Attachment E):

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 6:

**Table 6. Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD 5-day @ 20°C	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>a</sup>	167	250	500	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>a</sup>	167	250	500	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Zinc, Total Recoverable	ug/L	139	--	279	--	--
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/L	29	--	58.2	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/L	43.5	--	87.2	--	--
beta-BHC	ug/L	0.06	--	0.12	--	--
Ammonia	mg/L	3.2		9.0		
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	0.01 <sup>b</sup>	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	--	--
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	23 <sup>d</sup>	--	240	--	--

a Based upon a dry weather treatment design flow of 2.0 mgd.  
 b 4-day average.  
 c 1-hour average.  
 d Monthly median.

- b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of BOD 5-day 20°C and total suspended solids shall not be less than 85 percent.
- c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
  - i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
  - ii. 90%, median for any three or more consecutive bioassays.
- d. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:
  - i. 0.01 mg/L, as a 4-day average;
  - ii. 0.02 mg/L, as a 1-hour average;
- e. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:
  - i. 23 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a monthly median; and
  - ii. 240 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period.
- f. **Average Daily Discharge Flow.** The monthly average daily dry weather (May through September) discharge flow shall not exceed 2.0 mgd. Flows occurring in May shall be excluded from this limitation if significant rain events occur or seasonal high groundwater conditions persist.

## 2. Interim Effluent Limitations- Not Applicable

### B. Land Discharge Specifications – Emergency Storage Pond

1. The discharge of waste classified as “hazardous” as defined in section 2521(a) of Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), or “designated”, as defined in section 13173 of the CWC, to the treatment ponds is prohibited.
2. The emergency storage pond shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
3. 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).
4. As a means of discerning compliance with Land Discharge Specification B.3, the dissolved oxygen content in the upper zone (1 foot) of wastewater in ponds shall not be less than 1.0 mg/L.
5. The emergency overflow pond shall be managed to prevent the breeding of mosquitoes. In particular:

- i. Weeds shall be minimized.
  - ii. Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
6. Public contact with the wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, or other acceptable alternatives.

### C. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable

## V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

### A. Surface Water Limitations

Receiving water limitations are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan and are a required part of this Order. 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 ten 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 which 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 95 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.
  - d. From 1 June to 31 August: Concentrations of dissolved oxygen to fall below 9.0 mg/L. When natural conditions lower dissolved oxygen below this level, the concentrations shall be maintained at or above 95 percent saturation.
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, raised above 8.5, nor changed by more than 0.5 units.
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 USEPA or the Executive Officer.
  - d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR §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 set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15.
  - g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 ug/L.
  - h. Diazinon concentrations in excess of 0.080 ug/L (1-hour average) or 0.050 ug/L (4-day average) to occur more than once every three years on average.
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 maximum contaminant levels specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
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, or to higher than 56°F when such an increase will be detrimental to the fishery, whichever is more restrictive.
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.** The turbidity to increase as follows:
  - a. More than 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU) where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTUs.
  - b. More than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs.
  - c. More than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs.
  - d. More than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

## **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. Any increase in total dissolved solids (TDS) or electrical conductivity (EC) concentrations, when compared to background, shall not exceed the increase typically caused by percolation discharge of domestic wastewater, and shall not violate water quality objectives, impact beneficial uses, or cause pollution or nuisance.
2. Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility shall not, in combination with other sources of the waste constituents, cause groundwater within influence of the Facility to contain waste constituents in concentrations in excess of natural background quality or that listed below, whichever is greater:
  - a. Total coliform organisms median of 2.2 MPN/100 mL over any seven-day period.
  - b. Chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

## VI. PROVISIONS

### A. Standard Provisions

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D of this Order.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions:
  - 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:

- *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under Section 405(d) of the Clean Water Act, 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.
- *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.
- *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 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 Regional Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Regional 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 Regional 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 USEPA under Section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.
- h. The discharge of any radiological, chemical or biological warfare agent or high-level, radiological waste is prohibited.
- i. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
- j. 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 Regional 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 five 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 Regional Water Board.
  - iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Regional Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within ninety days of having been advised in writing by the Regional Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Regional Water Board and USEPA 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 Regional Water Board, become a condition of this Order.
- k. The Discharger, upon written request of the Regional 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 Regional Water Board Standard Provision VI.A.2.m.

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 Regional Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which 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.

- I. A publicly owned treatment works (POTW) 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 three 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 four years, the Discharger shall notify the Regional 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 Regional Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.
- m. 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 Title 16, CCR, 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.
- n. Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Regional Water Board and USEPA.
- o. The Discharger shall conduct analysis on any sample provided by USEPA as part of the Discharge Monitoring Quality Assurance (DMQA) program. The results of any such analysis shall be submitted to USEPA's DMQA manager.
- p. 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.
- q. All monitoring and analysis 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.
- r. The Discharger shall file with the Regional Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in the Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to this Order.

- s. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Regional 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.
- t. The Regional Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the CWC, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- u. For POTWs, prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. (CWC section 1211).
- v. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, maximum daily effluent limitation, 1-hour average effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation contained in this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by telephone (530) 224-4845 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless the Regional Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by Attachment D, Section V.E.1 [40 CFR section 122.41(l)(6)(i)].

## **B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements**

- 1. The Discharger shall comply with the MRP, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E of this Order.

## **C. Special Provisions**

### **1. Reopener Provisions**

- a. 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, whole effluent toxicity, 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.
- b. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR section 122.62, including:
  - 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.
- 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 may be reopened and an effluent limitation imposed. If the Regional Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to evaluate the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on 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 CTR criteria for applicable priority pollutant inorganic constituents. In addition, site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for zinc. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or additional site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- f. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL).** This Order may be reopened and modified as necessary to implement any TMDLs that are adopted or modified and are applicable to the receiving water.
- g. **Technical Studies.** This Order may be reopened for addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements if the Discharger performs technical studies that demonstrate and justify a change or modification of effluent limits.
- h. **Effluent Quality and Treatment Performance.** This Order may be reopened, and the effluent limitations tightened, or other regulatory measures may be employed, to ensure that the quality of the receiving water is not unnecessarily degraded.

## 2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section V.). Furthermore, 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 toxicity numeric monitoring trigger established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent reoccurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This Provision includes requirements for the Discharger to develop and submit a TRE Work Plan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.
- i. **Initial Investigative Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Work Plan.** **Within 90 days of the effective date of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer. This should be a one to two page document including, at minimum:
- a) A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that will be used to identify potential causes and sources of effluent toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency;
  - b) A description of the facility's methods of maximizing in-house treatment efficiency and good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in operation of the facility; and
  - c) A discussion of who will conduct the Toxicity Identification Evaluation, if necessary (i.e. an in-house expert or outside contractor).
- ii. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. WET testing results exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring demonstrates a pattern of toxicity and requires the Discharger to initiate a TRE to address the effluent toxicity.
- iii. **Numeric Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is **> 9 TUc** (where TUc = 100/NOEC). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is

required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE. Further discussion on the monitoring trigger is included in the Fact Sheet.

iv. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four (4) chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e. one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:

- a) If the results of four (4) consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.
- b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (i.e. temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four (4) consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.
- c) If the result of any accelerated toxicity test exceeds the monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE to investigate the cause(s) of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. Within thirty (30) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Regional Water Board including, at minimum:
  - 1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including TRE WET monitoring schedule;
  - 2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
  - 3) A schedule for these actions.

Within sixty (60) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board a TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Work Plan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating

effluent toxicity. The TRE Work Plan must be developed in accordance with EPA guidance<sup>2</sup>.

- b. **Constituent Study.** Not Applicable.
- c. **Dilution Credit Justification Update.** The Discharger shall submit to the Regional Water Board an update of the dilution credits provided in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study for each effluent pollutant that has reasonable potential based on updated site-specific dilution ratios for specific criteria, i.e. acute, chronic, and human health criteria. An updated justification shall be submitted no later than **1 year prior to the expiration date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer.
- d. **Site-Specific Translator Study.** The Discharger shall submit to the Regional Board a site-specific translator study, performed in accordance with Section 1.4.1 of the SIP, by no later than **1 year prior to the expiration date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer.
- e. **BPTC Evaluation Tasks.** Not Applicable.

### 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Pollutant Minimization Program.** The Discharger shall develop and conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) as further described below when there is evidence (e.g., sample results reported as DNQ when the effluent limitation is less than the MDL, sample results from analytical methods more sensitive than those methods required by this Order, presence of whole effluent toxicity, health advisories for fish consumption, results of benthic or aquatic organism tissue sampling) that a priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either: 1) A sample result is reported as DNQ and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or 2) A sample result is reported as ND and the effluent limitation is less than the MDL, using definitions described in Attachment A and reporting protocols described in MRP Section X.

The PMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions and submittals acceptable to the Regional Water Board:

- i. An annual review and semi-annual monitoring of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutant(s), which may include fish tissue monitoring and other bio-uptake sampling;

---

<sup>2</sup> See Attachment F (Fact Sheet) Section VII.B.2.a. for a list of EPA guidance documents that must be considered in development of the TRE Workplan.

- ii. Quarterly monitoring for the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the influent to the wastewater treatment system;
- iii. Submittal of a control strategy designed to proceed toward the goal of maintaining concentrations of the reportable priority pollutant(s) in the effluent at or below the effluent limitation;
- iv. Implementation of appropriate cost-effective control measures for the reportable priority pollutant(s), consistent with the control strategy; and
- v. An annual status report that shall be sent to the Regional Water Board including:
  - (1) All PMP monitoring results for the previous year;
  - (2) A list of potential sources of the reportable priority pollutant(s);
  - (3) A summary of all actions undertaken pursuant to the control strategy; and
  - (4) A description of actions to be taken in the following year.

**b. Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger shall prepare a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the Facility. The plan shall be completed and submitted to the Regional Water Board **within 2 years of the effective date of this Order** for approval by the Executive Officer.

#### **4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications**

##### **a. Emergency Storage and Sludge Drying Pond Operating Requirements.**

- i. The treatment facilities and emergency storage ponds 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.
  - c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.

- iv. Freeboard shall never be less than two 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 inflow and infiltration 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 two 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 Land Discharge Specification B.2.

## **5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)**

### **a. Pretreatment Requirements.**

- i. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the necessary legal authorities, programs, and controls to ensure that the following incompatible wastes are not introduced to the treatment system, where incompatible wastes are:
  - a) Wastes which create a fire or explosion hazard in the treatment works;
  - b) Wastes which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case wastes with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is specially designed to accommodate such wastes;
  - c) Solid or viscous wastes in amounts which cause obstruction to flow in sewers, or which cause other interference with proper operation or treatment works;
  - d) Any waste, including oxygen demanding pollutants (BOD, *etc.*), released in such volume or strength as to cause inhibition or disruption in the treatment works, and subsequent treatment process upset and loss of treatment efficiency;
  - e) Heat in amounts that inhibit or disrupt biological activity in the treatment works, or that raise influent temperatures above 40°C (104°F), unless the Regional Water Board approves alternate temperature limits;
  - f) Petroleum oil, non-biodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause interference or pass through;

- g) Pollutants which result in the presence of toxic gases, vapors, or fumes within the treatment works in a quantity that may cause acute worker health and safety problems; and:
  - h) Any trucked or hauled pollutants, except at points predesignated by the Discharger.
- ii. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the legal authorities, programs, and controls necessary to ensure that indirect discharges do not introduce pollutants into the sewerage system that, either alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources:
- a) Flow through the system to the receiving water in quantities or concentrations that cause a violation of this Order; or,
  - b) Inhibit or disrupt treatment processes, treatment system operations, or sludge processes, use, or disposal and either cause a violation of this Order or prevent sludge use or disposal in accordance with this Order.

**b. Sludge/Biosolids Discharge Specifications**

- 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 Title 27, CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1, section 20005, et seq. Removal for further treatment, disposal, or reuse at sites (i.e., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a regional water quality control board will satisfy these specifications.
- ii. Sludge and solid waste shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, clarifiers, etc. as needed to ensure optimal plant performance.
- iii. 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 V.B. 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 V.B.
- iv. The use and disposal of biosolids shall comply with existing Federal and State laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 CFR 503. If the State Water Board and the Regional Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations

contained in 40 CFR 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 CFR 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.

**c. Biosolids Disposal Requirements**

- i. The Discharger shall comply with the Monitoring and Reporting Program for biosolids disposal contained in Attachment E.
- ii. Any proposed change in biosolids use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and U.S. EPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.
- iii. The Discharger is encouraged to comply with the “Manual of Good Practice for Agricultural Land Application of Biosolids” developed by the California Water Environment Association.

**d. Biosolids Storage Requirements**

- i. Facilities for the storage of Class B biosolids shall be located, designed and maintained to restrict public access to biosolids.
- ii. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed and maintained to prevent washout or inundation from a storm or flood with a return frequency of 100 years.
- iii. Biosolids storage facilities, which contain biosolids, shall be designed and maintained to contain all storm water falling on the biosolids storage area during a rainfall year with a return frequency of 100 years.
- iv. Biosolids storage facilities shall be designed, maintained and operated to minimize the generation of leachate.

- e. **Collection System.** On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order 2006-0003, a Statewide General WDR for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order 2006-0003 and any future revisions thereto. Order 2006-0003 requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the General WDR. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under State Water Board Order 2006-0003 for operation of its wastewater collection system.

Regardless of the coverage obtained under Order 2006-0003, the Discharger's collection system is part of the treatment system that is subject to this Order. As such, pursuant to federal regulations, the Discharger must properly operate and maintain its collection system [40 CFR section 122.41(e)], report any non-compliance [40 CFR section 122.41(l)(6) and (7)], and mitigate any discharge from the collection system in violation of this Order [40 CFR. section 122.41(d)].

- f. This permit, and the Monitoring and Reporting Program which is a part of this permit, requires that certain parameters be monitored on a continuous basis. The wastewater treatment plant is not staffed on a full time basis. Permit violations or system upsets can go undetected during this period. The Discharger is required to establish an electronic system for operator notification for continuous recording device alarms. For existing continuous monitoring systems, the electronic notification system shall be installed **within six months of adoption** of this permit. For systems installed following permit adoption, the notification system shall be installed simultaneously.

## 6. Other Special Provisions

- a. 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

## 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

### VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

Compliance with the limitations contained in this Order will be determined as specified below:

- A. **Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides Receiving Water Limitations.** The non-detectable (ND) limitation applies to each individual pesticide. No individual pesticide may be present in the receiving water at detectable concentrations. The Discharger shall use USEPA standard analytical techniques for persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides with a minimum acceptable reporting level as indicated in appendix 4 of the SIP.
- B. **BOD and TSS Effluent Limitations.** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD and TSS required in **Section IV.A.1.a.** shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations **Section IV.A.1.b.** for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of 20°C BOD (5-day) and total suspended solids 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.
- C. **Average Daily Discharge Flow Effluent Limitations.** The Average Daily Discharge Flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the Average Daily Discharge Flow effluent limitations will be measured at times when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring.
- D. **Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations.** 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.

## ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

**Arithmetic Mean (u)**, 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:

$$\text{Arithmetic mean} = u = \Sigma x / n \quad \text{where: } \Sigma x \text{ is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and } n \text{ is the number of samples.}$$

**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.

**Best Practicable Treatment or Control (BPTC):** BPTC is a requirement of State Water Resources Control Board Resolution 68-16 – “Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California” (referred to as the “Antidegradation Policy”). BPTC is the treatment or control of a 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.” Pollution is defined in CWC Section 13050(I). In general, an exceedance of a water quality objective in the Basin Plan constitutes “pollution”.

**Bioaccumulative** pollutants are 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)** 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)** are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL.

**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.

**Effluent Concentration Allowance (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** 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.

**Estimated Chemical Concentration** is the estimated chemical concentration that results from the confirmed detection of the substance by the analytical method below the ML value.

**Estuaries** mean 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.

**Inland Surface Waters** are 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)** means 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** is 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)** 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 title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

**Minimum Level (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** 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.

**Not Detected (ND)** are those sample results less than the laboratory's MDL.

**Ocean Waters** are 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.

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

**Pollutant Minimization Program (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 Regional 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** 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 or Regional Water Board.

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

**Satellite Collection System** is 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** is any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Regional Water Board Basin Plan.

**Standard Deviation ( $\sigma$ )** is a measure of variability that is calculated as follows:

$$\sigma = \left( \frac{\sum[(x - u)^2]}{(n - 1)} \right)^{0.5}$$

where:

x is the observed value;


u is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and

n is the number of samples.

**Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (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.)

**ATTACHMENT B – MAP**



CITY OF ANDERSON Water Pollution Control Plant  SHASTA COUNTY	SECTIONS 11, T30N, R4W, MDB&M USGS 7.5' COTTONWOOD QUAD  Scale: 1"=2000'	
--	---	--

### ATTACHMENT C – AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH



## **ATTACHMENT D –STANDARD PROVISIONS**

### **I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE**

#### **A. Duty to Comply**

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action, for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a permit renewal application. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a).)
2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under Section 405(d) of the CWA 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 or sludge use or disposal 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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, § 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 (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1));
2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2));
3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3)); and
4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4).)

## **G. Bypass**

1. Definitions
  - a. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i).)
  - b. "Severe property damage" means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii).)
2. Bypass not exceeding limitations. The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3, 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 Regional 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 Regional 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 Regional Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Regional Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)
5. Notice
  - a. Anticipated bypass. If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)
  - b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)

## H. Upset

Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(1).)

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was

caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).).

2. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A Discharger who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):
  - a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));
  - b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));
  - c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
  - 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 noncompliance does not stay any Order condition. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(f).)

### **B. Duty to Reapply**

If the Discharger wishes to continue an activity regulated by 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 Regional Water Board. The Regional Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and 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 results must be conducted according to test procedures under Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under Part 136 unless otherwise specified in Part 503 unless other test procedures have been specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 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 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 Regional 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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Wat. Code, § 13267.)

### **B. Signatory and Certification Requirements**

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, and/or USEPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k).)
2. All permit applications shall be signed by 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 USEPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).)
3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
  - a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
  - b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
  - c. The written authorization is submitted to the Regional 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 Regional Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)
5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

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

### **C. Monitoring Reports**

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(l)(4).)
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Regional Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under Part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under Part 136 unless otherwise specified in Part 503, or as specified in this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Regional 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 noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this Order, shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(5).)

## **E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting**

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)
2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):
  - a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
  - b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)
3. The Regional Water Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii).)

## **F. Planned Changes**

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

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).)
3. 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 Noncompliance**

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

### **H. Other Noncompliance**

The Discharger shall report all instances of noncompliance 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. (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 Regional Water Board, State Water Board, or USEPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8).)

## **VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT**

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

## **VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS**

### **A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)**

All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Regional 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).)

## Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program

### Table of Contents

Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) .....	E-1
I. General Monitoring Provisions.....	E-1
II. Monitoring Locations .....	E-2
III. Influent Monitoring Requirements.....	E-2
A. Monitoring Location INF-001.....	E-2
IV. Effluent Monitoring Requirements .....	E-3
A. Monitoring Location EFF-001.....	E-3
V. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements .....	E-4
VI. Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable .....	E-7
VII. Reclamation Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable.....	E-7
VIII. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements – Surface Water.....	E-8
A. Monitoring Location R-001 .....	E-8
B. Monitoring Location R-002.....	E-9
IX. Other Monitoring Requirements.....	E-9
A. Biosolids .....	E-9
B. Municipal Water Supply .....	E-10
X. Reporting Requirements.....	E-10
A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	E-10
B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs) .....	E-12
C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) .....	E-14
D. Other Reports .....	E-14

### List of Tables

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations .....	E-2
Table E-2. Influent Monitoring.....	E-2
Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring .....	E-3
Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series.....	E-6
Table E-5a. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements for R-001 .....	E-8
Table E-5b. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements for R-002 .....	E-9
Table E-6. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements.....	E-10
Table E-7. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule .....	E-13

## **ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)**

The Code of Federal Regulations section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code Sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements, which implement the federal and state 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 this Regional Water Board.
- B. Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses shall be conducted at a laboratory certified for such analyses by the State Department of Health Services. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger, analyses performed by a noncertified 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 must be kept in the laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Regional Water Board staff. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Regional Water Board.
- C. All analyses shall be performed in a laboratory certified to perform such analyses by the California Department of Health Services. Laboratories that perform sample analyses shall be identified in all monitoring reports.
- 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 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 noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.

## 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	Treatment plant headworks.
D-001	EFF-001	Downstream from the last connection through which wastes can be admitted into the outfall
--	R-001	Sacramento River - 100 feet upstream from point of discharge
--	R-002	Sacramento River – One-quarter mile downstream from the point of discharge.
--	BIO-001	Biosolids Storage Area
--	SPL-001	Water Supply

## III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

### A. Monitoring Location INF-001

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

**Table E-2. Influent Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	mgd	Continuous	Daily	-
BOD 5-day 20°C	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	2/month	<sup>2</sup>
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>1</sup>	2/month	<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 24-hour flow proportional.

<sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136.

2. A 24-hour composite influent sample shall be collected annually and analyzed for total recoverable concentrations of antimony, arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, chromium (III), chromium (VI), copper, lead, mercury, nickel, selenium, silver, thallium, zinc, and cyanide, with a maximum ML as specified in the SIP. The influent sample shall be collected at the same time an effluent sample is obtained for analysis of priority pollutants.

#### IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

##### A. Monitoring Location EFF-001

1. The Discharger shall monitor effluent at EFF-001 as follows. Effluent samples should be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. Time of collection of samples shall be recorded. 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:

**Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	mgd	Meter	Continuous	
Total Residual Chlorine <sup>1</sup>	mg/L	Meter	Continuous	<sup>9</sup>
pH	pH Units	Grab	1/day	<sup>9</sup>
Temperature <sup>2</sup>	°F (°C)	Grab	1/week	<sup>9</sup>
BOD 5-day 20°C	mg/L, lbs/day	24-hr Composite <sup>8</sup>	1/week	<sup>9</sup>
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L, lbs/day	24-hr Composite <sup>8</sup>	1/week	<sup>9</sup>
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	2/week	<sup>9</sup>
Ammonia (as N) <sup>2,3</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	umhos/cm	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Zinc, Total Recoverable	ug/L	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Hardness <sup>4</sup>	mg/L CaCO3	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/L	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/L	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Total Phosphorous	ug/L	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Ortho Phosphate	ug/L	Grab	1/month	<sup>9</sup>
Cadmium, Total Recoverable	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	<sup>9</sup>
Copper, Total Recoverable	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	<sup>9</sup>
Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	<sup>9</sup>
Total Dissolved Solids <sup>5</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	<sup>9</sup>
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	<sup>9</sup>
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	<sup>9</sup>
Aluminum, Total	ug/L	Grab	1/year	<sup>9</sup>
Standard Minerals <sup>6</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/year	<sup>9</sup>
Priority Pollutants <sup>7</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/year	<sup>9</sup>

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
1 Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L. Report peak 1-hour average for each day and peak 4-day average for the month.				
2 Concurrent with biotoxicity monitoring.				
3 Report as total and un-ionized ammonia.				
4 Concurrent with cadmium, copper, zinc, and priority pollutant testing.				
5 Concurrent with electrical conductivity monitoring.				
6 Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, sulfate, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).				
7 Concurrent with receiving surface water sampling at R-001 and R-002 (receiving water hardness and pH shall be determined at R-001 at the same time EFF-001 sample taken).				
8 24-hour flow proportioned.				
9 Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136. For priority pollutant constituents with effluent limitations, detection limits shall be below the effluent limitations. If the lowest minimum level (ML) published in Appendix 4 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Plan or SIP) is not below the effluent limitation, the detection limit shall be the lowest ML. For priority pollutant constituents without effluent limitations, the detection limits shall be equal to or less than the lowest ML published in Appendix 4 of the SIP. Where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.				

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 data 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.

**V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY 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 – the Discharger shall perform quarterly acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling.
  2. Sample Types – For static non-renewal and 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 the effluent 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 conduct three species chronic toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – the Discharger shall perform annual three species chronic toxicity testing.
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be 24-hour flow proportional or time-weighted composites and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at the effluent monitoring location EFF-002. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from the R-001 sampling location, as identified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program.
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:
  - The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
  - The fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (larval survival and growth test); and
  - 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.*
6. Reference Toxicant – As required by the 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 – The chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-5, below. The receiving water control shall be used as the diluent (unless the receiving water is toxic). The Discharger may initially test at 100 percent effluent and if there are no toxicity effects observed at 100 percent effluent, testing utilizing the dilution series identified in Table E-5 will not be required. If toxicity effects are observed at 100 percent effluent, chronic toxicity testing utilizing

the dilution series must be initiated within 24 hours of knowledge of laboratory results.

8. **Test Failure** –The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than fourteen (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 *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), 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 Table 6 on page 52 of the Method Manual. (A retest is only required in this case if the test results do not exceed the monitoring trigger specified in (Provisions VI.C.2.a.iii.)

**Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series**

Sample	Dilutions (%)					Controls	
	100	75	50	25	12.5	Receiving Water	Laboratory Water
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	12.5	0	0
% Receiving Water	0	25	50	75	87.5	100	0
% Laboratory Water	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

- C. **WET Testing Notification Requirements.** The Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board within 24-hrs 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, whole effluent toxicity monitoring shall be reported as follows:
  1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Regular chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Regional Water Board within 30 days following completion of the test, and shall contain, at minimum:
    - a. The results expressed in TUC, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as 100/LC<sub>50</sub>, 100/EC<sub>25</sub>, 100/IC<sub>25</sub>, and 100/IC<sub>50</sub>, as appropriate.
    - b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;

- c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the percent minimum significant difference (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 discharger self-monitoring reports 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 frequency, i.e., either quarterly, monthly, accelerated, or TRE. (Note: items a through c, above, are only required when testing is performed using the full dilution series.)

2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports and reported as percent survival.
3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for Toxicity Reduction Evaluations shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Work 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 – NOT APPLICABLE

## VII. RECLAMATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

**VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – SURFACE WATER**

**A. Monitoring Location R-001**

1. The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at R-001 (100 feet upstream from the point of discharge) as follows:

**Table E-5a. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements for R-001**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/month	3
pH	Standard Units	Grab	1/month	3
Hardness	mg CaCO3	Grab	1/month	3
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab	1/month	3
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/month	3
Hardness	mg/L CaCO3	Grab	1/month	3
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	umhos/cm	Grab	1/quarter	3
Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	3
Copper, Total Recoverable <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	3
Zinc, Total Recoverable <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	3
Cadmium, Total Recoverable <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	3
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/quarter	3
Ammonia	mg/L	Grab	1/year	3
Standard Minerals <sup>2</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/year	3
Sulfide	mg/L	Grab	1/year	3
Priority Pollutants <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/year	3

1. Receiving water hardness and pH required at time of sampling, concurrent with monitoring at R-002.
2. Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, sulfate, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).
3. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.

2. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions through the reach bounded by R-001 and R-002. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:

- |                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| a. Floating or suspended matter | e. Visible films, sheens or coatings       |
| b. Discoloration                | f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths |
| c. Bottom deposits              | g. Potential nuisance conditions           |
| d. Aquatic life                 |  |

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

**B. Monitoring Location R-002**

1. The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at R-002 (one-quarter mile downstream of point of discharge) as follows:

**Table E-5b. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements for R-002**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/month	1
pH	Standard Units	Grab	1/month	1
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab	1/month	1
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/month	1
Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	1
Copper, Total Recoverable <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	1
Copper, Dissolved <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	1
Zinc, Total Recoverable <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	1
Zinc, Dissolved <sup>1</sup>	ug/L	Grab	1/quarter	1

1. Receiving water hardness and pH required at time of sampling, concurrent with monitoring at R-001.
2. Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; for priority pollutants the methods must meet the lowest minimum levels (MLs) specified in Attachment 4 of the SIP, where no methods are specified for a given pollutant, by methods approved by this Regional Water Board or the State Water Board.

2. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions through the reach bounded by R-001 and R-002. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:

- |                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| a. Floating or suspended matter | e. Visible films, sheens or coatings       |
| b. Discoloration                | f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths |
| c. Bottom deposits              | g. Potential nuisance conditions           |
| d. Aquatic life                 |  |

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

**IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Biosolids**

**1. Monitoring Location BIO-001**

1. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected annually at Monitoring Location BIO-001 in accordance with EPA's POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document, August 1989, and tested for priority pollutants listed in 40 CFR section 122 Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols).
2. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected when sludge is removed from the ponds for disposal in accordance with USEPA's POTW Sludge Sampling and

Analysis Guidance Document, August 1989, and tested for the metals listed in Title 22.

3. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of **five years**. A log shall be kept of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log should be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.
4. Upon removal of sludge, the Discharger shall submit characterization of sludge quality, including sludge percent solids and quantitative results of chemical analysis for the priority pollutants listed in 40 CFR 122 Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols). Suggested methods for analysis of sludge are provided in USEPA publications titled "Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste: Physical/Chemical Methods" and "Test Methods for Organic Chemical Analysis of Municipal and Industrial Wastewater". Recommended analytical holding times for sludge samples should reflect those specified in 40 CFR 136.6.3(e). Other guidance is available in USEPA's POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document, August 1989.

**B. Municipal Water Supply**

**1. Monitoring Location SPL-001**

The Discharger shall monitor the Municipal Water Supply at SPL-001 as follows. A sampling station shall be established where a representative sample of the municipal water supply can be obtained. Municipal water supply samples shall be collected at approximately the same time as effluent samples.

**Table E-6. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C <sup>1</sup>	umhos/cm	Grab	1/quarter	-

If the water supply is from more than one source, the EC shall be reported as a weighted average and include copies of supporting calculations.

**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 Regional 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 Regional Water Board, on or before each compliance due date, the specified document or a written report detailing compliance or noncompliance with the specific date and task. If noncompliance is reported, the Discharger shall state the reasons for noncompliance and include an estimate of the date when the Discharger will be in compliance. The Discharger shall notify the Regional Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.
4. The Discharger shall report to the Regional 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.
5. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable Reporting Level (RL) and the current Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 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 as well as the words "Estimated Concentration" (may be shortened to "Est. Conc."). 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 the 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.
  - e. For non-priority pollutants and field lab-measured pollutants and parameters, reporting of the MDL and result is adequate.
6. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an AMEL, AWEL, or 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 "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) or "Not Detected" (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.

## **B. Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs)**

1. At any time during the term of this permit, the State or Regional Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>). Until such notification is given, the Discharger shall submit hard copy SMRs. The CIWQS Web site will provide additional directions for SMR submittal in the event there will be service interruption for electronic submittal.
2. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board by the **first day** of the second month following sample collection. Quarterly and annual monitoring results shall be submitted by the **first day of the second month following each calendar quarter, semi-annual period, and year**, respectively.
3. In reporting the monitoring data, the Discharger shall arrange the data in tabular form so that the date, the constituents, and the concentrations are readily discernible. The data shall be summarized in such a manner to illustrate clearly whether the discharge complies with waste discharge requirements. The highest daily maximum for the month, monthly and weekly averages, and medians, and removal efficiencies (%) for BOD and Total Suspended Solids, shall be determined and recorded as needed to demonstrate compliance.
4. With the exception of flow, all constituents monitored on a continuous basis (metered), shall be reported as daily maximums, daily minimums, and daily averages; flow shall be reported as the total volume discharged per day for each day of discharge.
5. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant at the locations designated herein more frequently than is required by this Order, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the values required in the discharge

monitoring report form. Such increased frequency shall be indicated on the discharge monitoring report form.

6. A letter transmitting the self-monitoring reports shall accompany each report. Such a letter shall include a discussion of requirement violations found during the reporting period, and actions taken or planned for correcting noted violations, such as operation or facility modifications. If the Discharger has previously submitted a report describing corrective actions and/or a time schedule for implementing the corrective actions, reference to the previous correspondence will be satisfactory. The transmittal letter shall contain the penalty of perjury statement by the Discharger, or the Discharger's authorized agent, as described in the Standard Provisions.
7. SMRs must be submitted to the Regional Water Board, signed and certified as required by the Standard Provisions (Attachment D), to the address listed below:

Regional Water Quality Control Board  
 Central Valley Region  
 415 Knollcrest Drive, Suite #100  
 Redding, CA 96002-0129

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

**Table E-7. 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
Hourly	Permit effective date	Hourly	Submit with monthly SMR
Daily	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
Weekly	Sunday following permit effective date or on permit effective date if on a Sunday	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
Monthly	First day of calendar month following permit effective date or on permit effective date if that date is first day of the month	1 <sup>st</sup> day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	32 days from the end of the monitoring period
Quarterly	Closest of January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1 following (or on) permit effective date	January 1 through March 31 April 1 through June 30 July 1 through September 30 October 1 through December 31	32 days from the end of the monitoring period
Semiannually	Closest of January 1 or July 1 following (or on) permit effective date	January 1 through June 30 July 1 through December 31	32 days from the end of the monitoring period

Annually	January 1 following (or on) permit effective date	January 1 through December 31	32 days from the end of the monitoring period
----------	---	-------------------------------	---

**C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs)**

1. As described in Section X.B.1 above, at any time during the term of this permit, the State or Regional Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit SMRs that will satisfy federal requirements for submittal of Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs). Until such notification is given, the Discharger shall submit DMRs in accordance with the requirements described below.
2. DMRs must be signed and certified as required by the standard provisions (Attachment D). The Discharger shall submit the original DMR and one copy of the DMR to the address listed below:

Standard Mail	FedEx/UPS/ Other Private Carriers
State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center PO Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-1000	State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center 1001 I Street, 15 <sup>th</sup> Floor Sacramento, CA 95814

3. All discharge monitoring results must be reported on the official USEPA pre-printed DMR forms (EPA Form 3320-1). Forms that are self-generated cannot be accepted unless they follow the exact same format as EPA form 3320-1.

**D. Other Reports**

1. Within **60 days** of permit adoption, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining minimum levels, method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval, with a goal to achieve detection levels below applicable water quality criteria. At a minimum, the Discharger shall comply with the monitoring requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in Section 2.3 and 2.4 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California*, adopted 2 March 2000 by the State Water Resources Control Board. All peaks identified by analytical methods shall be reported.
2. The Discharger’s sanitary sewer system collects wastewater using sewers, pipes, pumps, and/or other conveyance systems and directs the raw sewage to the wastewater treatment plant. A “sanitary sewer overflow” is defined as a discharge to ground or surface water from the sanitary sewer system at any point upstream of the wastewater treatment plant. Sanitary sewer overflows are prohibited by this Order. All violations must be reported as required in Standard Provisions. Facilities (such as wet wells, regulated impoundments, tanks, highlines, etc.) may be part of a sanitary sewer system and discharges to these facilities are not considered sanitary

sewer overflows, provided that the waste is fully contained within these temporary storage facilities.

3. **Annual Operations and Performance Report.** By **30 January** of each year, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing 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 wastewater treatment plant as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when these documents were last revised and last reviewed for adequacy.
  - e. Tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Tabular summaries shall be available in an electronic format. 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 waste discharge requirements.
  - f. An analysis of the trends in effluent quality. If a trend of increasing pollutant concentration is evident, a discussion of likely causes of such increases shall be included.
  
4. **Annual Pretreatment Reporting Requirements – Not Applicable.**

## ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

### Table of Contents

Attachment F – Fact Sheet .....	F-1
I. Permit Information .....	F-1
II. Facility Description .....	F-2
A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls .....	F-2
B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters.....	F-2
C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data .....	F-3
D. Compliance Summary.....	F-4
E. Planned Changes .....	F-4
III. Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	F-4
A. Legal Authority .....	F-4
B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) .....	F-5
C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans .....	F-5
D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List .....	F-7
E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations.....	F-8
IV. Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-9
A. Discharge Prohibitions .....	F-10
B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-10
1. Scope and Authority .....	F-10
2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations .....	F-11
3. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations - Discharge Point D-001 .....	F-12
C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs).....	F-12
1. Scope and Authority .....	F-12
2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives.....	F-12
3. Determining the Need for WQBELs.....	F-19
4. WQBEL Calculations .....	F-29
5. Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001..	F-33
6. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).....	F-34
D. Final Effluent Limitations.....	F-35
1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations.....	F-35
2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations.....	F-36
3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements. ....	F-36
4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy .....	F-36
5. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations - Discharge Point D-001 .....	F-37
E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable.....	F-38
F. Land Discharge Specifications.....	F-38
G. Reclamation Specifications.....	F-38
V. Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations .....	F-38
A. Surface Water .....	F-38
B. Groundwater .....	F-42
VI. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	F-42
A. Influent Monitoring .....	F-43
B. Effluent Monitoring.....	F-43
C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements .....	F-43

D.	Receiving Water Monitoring.....	F-43
1.	Surface Water.....	F-43
2.	Groundwater – Not Applicable.....	F-44
E.	Other Monitoring Requirements.....	F-44
VII.	Rationale for Provisions.....	F-44
A.	Standard Provisions.....	F-44
B.	Special Provisions.....	F-44
1.	Reopener Provisions.....	F-44
2.	Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-45
3.	Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention.....	F-49
4.	Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-49
5.	Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only).....	F-49
6.	Other Special Provisions.....	F-50
7.	Compliance Schedules- Not Applicable.....	F-51
VIII.	Public Participation.....	F-51
A.	Notification of Interested Parties.....	F-51
B.	Written Comments.....	F-51
C.	Public Hearing.....	F-52
D.	Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions.....	F-52
E.	Information and Copying.....	F-52
F.	Register of Interested Persons.....	F-52
G.	Additional Information.....	F-53

**List of Tables**

Table F-1.	Facility Information.....	F-1
Table F-2.	Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data.....	F-3
Table F-3.	Historical Effluent Flow.....	F-4
Table F-4.	Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations.....	F-12
Table F-5.	Anderson WPCP Mixing Zone Study Results.....	F-15
Table F-6.	Dilution Ratios Utilized in Mixing Zone Study.....	F-17
Table F-7.	Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis for Inorganics.....	F-21
Table F-8.	Summary of Organic Compounds with Reasonable Potential.....	F-22
Table F-9.	Summary of Applicable Priority Pollutant Criterion/Objectives.....	F-22
Table F-10.	Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives.....	F-27
Table F-11.	WQBEL Calculations for Ammonia.....	F-31
Table F-12.	WQBEL Calculations for Chlorodibromomethane.....	F-31
Table F-13.	WQBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane.....	F-31
Table F-14.	WQBEL Calculations for beta-BHC.....	F-32
Table F-15.	WQBEL Calculations for Zinc.....	F-32
Table F-16.	Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations.....	F-33
Table F-17.	Summary of Final Effluent Limitations.....	F-37

## ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in section II of this Order, this Fact Sheet includes 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**

<b>WDID</b>	<b>5A450100001</b>
<b>Discharger</b>	City of Anderson
<b>Name of Facility</b>	Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant
<b>Facility Address</b>	3701 Rupert Road
	Anderson, CA 96007
	Shasta County
<b>Facility Contact, Title and Phone</b>	Robert Berry, Chief Plant Operator, (530) 378-6665
<b>Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports</b>	Robert Berry, Chief Plant Operator, (530) 378-6665
<b>Mailing Address</b>	1887 Howard Street, Anderson, CA 96007
<b>Billing Address</b>	1887 Howard Street, Anderson, CA 96007
<b>Type of Facility</b>	POTW
<b>Major or Minor Facility</b>	Major
<b>Threat to Water Quality</b>	1
<b>Complexity</b>	A
<b>Pretreatment Program</b>	N
<b>Reclamation Requirements</b>	N
<b>Facility Design Flow</b>	2.0 mgd
<b>Watershed</b>	Sacramento River
<b>Receiving Water</b>	Sacramento River
<b>Receiving Water Type</b>	Inland surface water

- A. The City of Anderson (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant (hereinafter Facility), a Publicly Owned Treatment Works.

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, and is currently regulated by Order No. R5-2001-0195 which was adopted on 27 July 2001 and expired on 1 July 2006. The terms and conditions of the current Order have been automatically continued and remain in effect until new Waste Discharge Requirements and NPDES permit are adopted pursuant to this Order.
- C.** The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge and submitted an application for renewal of its Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit on 29 December 2005. A site visit was conducted on 7 September 2007, to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and conditions.

## **II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION**

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the community of Anderson, CA and serves a population of approximately 10,000. The WWTP design dry weather average flow capacity is 2.0 mgd.

### **A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment or Controls**

The treatment system consists of influent pump station, bar screens, complete mix activated sludge with secondary clarification, followed by dual media pressure filtration, followed by disinfection using chlorine, and dechlorination using sulfur dioxide. There is also a 3.0 million-gallon emergency storage basin. Solids handling processes include aerobic digestion of waste activated sludge followed by humus pond storage for stabilization and solar drying on sand drying beds. Biosolids are disposed at a sanitary landfill and land applied on property owned by the City of Redding. The Report of Waste Discharge describes the discharge as follows:

Monthly Average Dry Weather Flow:	1.4 mgd
Design Average Dry Weather Flow:	2.0 mgd
Design Peak Day Wet Weather Flow:	6.0 mgd

### **B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters**

1. The Facility (Assessor's Parcel No. 201-230-30) is located in Section 11, T30N, R4W, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B (Figure B-1), 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 40° 28' 8"N and longitude 122° 16' 45"W.
3. Discharge Point 001 is located within the Enterprise Flat Hydrologic Area (508.10) of the Redding Hydrologic Unit as defined by the interagency hydrologic map for the Sacramento Hydrologic Basin prepared by the Department of Water Resources (1986).

4. An additional receiving water monitoring location is located at the Caldwell Park boat launch ramp in Redding at a point latitude 40° 35' 38.2"N and longitude 122° 23' 54.0"W. The Caldwell Park receiving water location has been utilized as the upstream station of four major discharges (3 POTWs and 1 industrial discharger) within an 11 mile reach of the Sacramento River, with Anderson WPCP as the second to last downstream discharger. Historically, monitoring at R-001a has facilitated the allocation of assimilative capacity in the receiving water throughout this reach of river.

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

Effluent limitations contained in the existing Order for discharges from discharge point D-001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of the previous Order are as follows:

**Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Monitoring Data Jan. 2003 – May 2007	
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Max Daily	4-day Average	Monthly Median	Average Monthly Discharge	Maximum Daily Discharge
BOD <sup>1</sup>	mg/L	10	15	30			4.7	15.0
	lbs/day <sup>2</sup>	167	250	500	--	--	57.8	238
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	334	500	1001				
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30			2.3	10.2
	lbs/day <sup>2</sup>	167	250	500	--	--	29.7	108
	lbs/day <sup>3</sup>	334	500	1001				
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	--	0.02 <sup>4</sup>	0.01	--	0.00	0.00
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100mL	--	--	500	--	23	4.6 <sup>5</sup>	75
pH	pH units			9.0 <sup>6</sup>			7.3	8.1

<sup>1</sup> 5-day, 20°C Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)

<sup>2</sup> Based upon a design dry weather treatment capacity of 2.0 mgd

<sup>3</sup> Based upon a design peak-day wet weather flow of 4.0 mgd

<sup>4</sup> 1-hour average

<sup>5</sup> Average monthly median

<sup>6</sup> pH shall be between 6.0 and 9.0

Effluent limits contained in the existing Order included an effluent flow limit of 2.0 mgd from May through October. Historical effluent flow is presented in Table F-3:

**Table F-3. Historical Effluent Flow**

Effluent Discharge (mgd)	<u>Dry Weather</u> Design Average Dry Weather Flow: 2.0 Discharge Limit (May-October): 2.0		<u>Wet Weather</u> Design Peak Day Wet Weather Flow: 6.0
	May – October	May – September	November - April
<b><u>Monthly Average</u></b> <sup>(1)</sup>			
Min	1.2	1.2	1.2
Max	2.0	2.0	2.3
Average	1.4	1.4	1.7
<b><u>Peak Daily</u></b> <sup>(2)</sup>			
Min	1.36	1.3	1.37
Max	2.6	2.6	4.0

(1) Based on reported monthly flow averages from January 2003 through May 2007

(2) Based on reported peak daily values from January 2003 through May 2007.

**D. Compliance Summary**

The following is a summary of violations noted during the monthly monitoring and reporting review since the last permit cycle:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Effluent Discharge Violations</u>
2002	None noted.
2003	None noted.
2004	None noted.
2005	1. May 2005 reported monthly BOD concentration was 11.6 mg/L. Reported value exceeded monthly concentration limit of 10 mg/L. 2. May 2005 reported monthly average BOD mass was 196 lbs/day. Reported value exceeded monthly average mass limit of 167 lbs/day.
2006	None noted.

**E. Planned Changes**

There is currently a sewer master plan study underway to address future needs.

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

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the applicable plans, policies, and regulations identified in section II of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements (Findings). This section provides supplemental information, where appropriate, for the plans, policies, and regulations relevant to the discharge.

**A. Legal Authority**

See Limitations and Discharge Requirements - Findings, Section II.C.

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

See Limitations and Discharge Requirements - Findings, Section II.E.

## **C. State and Federal Regulations, Policies, and Plans**

1. **Water Quality Control Plans.** The Regional Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised February 2007), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (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. In addition, State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63 requires that, with certain exceptions, the Regional Water Board assign the municipal and domestic supply use to water bodies that do not have beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. The beneficial uses of the Sacramento River downstream of the discharge are municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply, including stock watering; industrial service supply; hydropower generation; water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting; non-contact water recreation, including aesthetic enjoyment; commercial and sport fishing; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; warm migration of aquatic organisms; cold migration of aquatic organisms; warm spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; cold spawning, reproduction, and /or early development; wildlife habitat; and navigation.

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 CFR sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the State 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. Section 131.3(e), 40 CFR, defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after November 28, 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR 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.

This Order contains Effluent Limitations requiring an advanced secondary level of treatment, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

The Regional Water Board has considered the factors listed in CWC section 13241 in establishing these requirements, as discussed in more detail in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F, Section IV.

2. **Thermal Plan. Not Applicable.**
3. **Bay-Delta Plan. Not Applicable.**
4. **Antidegradation Policy.** 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 No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution No. 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Regional Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. As discussed in detail in the Fact Sheet (Attachment F, Section IV.D.4.) the discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.
5. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o)(2) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at title 40, Code of Federal Regulations section 122.44(l) prohibit 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. Compliance with the Anti-Backsliding requirements is discussed in Section IV.D.3.
6. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act.** Section 13263.6(a), California 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 Regional Water Board has adopted numeric water quality objectives in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River Basin (Basin Plan) for the following constituents: arsenic, barium, cadmium, copper, cyanide, iron, manganese, silver, and zinc for which numeric water quality objectives have been adopted for the receiving waters involved in this discharge. As detailed elsewhere in this Permit, available effluent quality data indicate that zinc does have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the numeric water quality objective included within the Basin Plan. An effluent limitation for zinc is included in this permit.

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 based on information from Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (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 CWC 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.

7. **Stormwater Requirements.** USEPA promulgated Federal Regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 CFR 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 stormwater program and are obligated to comply with the Federal Regulations.
8. **Endangered Species Act.** 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 sections 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. sections 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.

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

1. Under Section 303(d) of the 1972 Clean Water Act, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. 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 July 25, 2003 USEPA gave final approval to California's 2002 Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. The Basin Plan references this list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), 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 CFR 130, et seq.)*." The Basin Plan also states, "*Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. 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 listing for the Sacramento River from Keswick Dam to Cottonwood Creek includes: cadmium, copper, zinc, and unknown toxicity. The listing for the metals is mainly a result of long term effects of mining operations at Iron Mountain

Mine (located along this reach of river) in addition to other mines up stream of Shasta Dam.

2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads.** The US EPA requires the Regional Water Board to develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. The listing for unknown toxicity has a proposed TMDL completion date of 2019.

In April 2002, the Regional Board published the *Upper Sacramento River TMDL for Cadmium, Copper, and Zinc* final report. A waste load allocation and/or effluent limitations were not established by the final report, rather, proposed numeric acute and chronic targets for dissolved cadmium, copper, and zinc were issued as part of a TMDL program. Due to the proposed remedial activities scheduled for Iron Mountain Mine and other mine sites during the next five years, Regional Board staff proposed a 5-year TMDL water management strategy that included monitoring by NPDES-permitted dischargers for dissolved cadmium, copper, and zinc, and flow to quantify their dissolved metal loads. Review of ambient metal concentration data collected by staff, other agencies, and dischargers will allow for the determination of whether the upstream remediation efforts enable dissolved metal concentrations in the Sacramento River water to comply with the proposed targets. A review of the TMDL along with USEPA's 5-year review for the Iron Mountain Mine site is scheduled for 2008. This Order includes effluent and receiving water cadmium, copper, and zinc monitoring to comply with the TMDL water management strategy and for use in the review of the proposed numeric targets.

In addition, the May 2004 completion of Slickrock Creek Dam downstream of the Iron Mountain Mine site resulted in a significant decrease of cadmium, copper, and zinc from historic levels within the Sacramento River, downstream of Keswick Dam. For this reason the background receiving water data set for cadmium, copper, zinc, hardness, and pH only include data collected after the May 2004 completion of the Slickrock Creek Dam.

This Order contains a reopener provision to modify permit requirements, as necessary, to implement any changes to the TMDL.

## **E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations**

1. 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, California Code of Regulations (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.
2. The State Water Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California*. The requirements within this Order are consistent with the Policy.

#### 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 Clean Water Act (CWA) and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The Federal 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 CFR, § 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 CFR 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 CFR, §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 discharges 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: 40 CFR §122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards, and 40 CFR §122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where numeric water quality objectives have not been established. The Regional Water Board’s Basin Plan, page IV-17.00, contains an implementation policy (“Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives” that specifies that the Regional 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 CFR §122.44(d)(1). With respect to narrative objectives, the Regional Water Board must establish effluent limitations using one or more of three specified sources, including (1) 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 Regional

Water Board's "Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives") (40 CFR 122.44(d)(1) (vi) (A), (B) or (C)), or (3) an indicator parameter. The Basin Plan contains a narrative objective requiring that: "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life*" (narrative toxicity objective). The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that surface water and groundwater do not contain chemical constituents, discoloration, toxic substances, radionuclides, or taste and odor producing substances that adversely affect beneficial uses. 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 Basin Plan also limits chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect surface water beneficial uses. For waters designated as municipal, the Basin Plan specifies that, at a minimum, waters shall not contain concentrations of constituents that exceed Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL) of CCR Title 22. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

## **A. Discharge Prohibitions**

1. *As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 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 CFR 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 No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.*

## **B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations**

### **1. Scope and Authority**

Regulations promulgated in 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 POTWs [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 USEPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, USEPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 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 (BOD<sub>5</sub>), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

## 2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

- a. **BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS.** Federal Regulations, 40 CFR, Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. However, based on Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) an advanced secondary level of treatment is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream and the final effluent limitations for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are based on the technical capability of an advanced secondary process. BOD<sub>5</sub> is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. These standards for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the treatment processes. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. In applying 40 CFR Part 133 for weekly and monthly average BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS limitations, the application of advanced secondary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed; the 30-day average BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS limitations have been revised to 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of an advanced secondary system. In addition to the average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations, a daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS is included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. See Table F-4 for final technology-based effluent limitations required by this Order. In addition, 40 CFR 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. If 85 percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS must be achieved by a secondary treatment plant, it must also be achieved by an advanced secondary treatment plant. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS over each calendar month.
- b. **Flow.** The Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant was designed to provide an advanced secondary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 2.0 mgd. Therefore, this Order contains an average daily dry weather (May through September) discharge flow effluent limit of 2.0 mgd. Effluent discharge flows occurring in May shall be excluded from this limitation if significant rain events occur or seasonal high groundwater conditions persist during the month of May.

### 3. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations - Discharge Point D-001

**Table F-4. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
BOD <sub>5</sub> <sup>a</sup>	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>b</sup>	167	250	500		
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>b</sup>	167	250	500		
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Removal	85% removal BOD <sub>5</sub> and TSS					

<sup>a</sup> 5-day, 20°C Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD).

<sup>b</sup> Based upon a dry weather treatment design flow of 2.0 mgd.

### C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

#### 1. Scope and Authority

As specified in section 122.44(d)(1)(i), permits are required to include WQBELs for pollutants (including toxicity) that are or may be discharged at levels that cause, have reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above any state water quality standard. The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, 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.

#### 2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

- a. **Receiving Water.** The receiving water for the Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant is the Sacramento River. The beneficial uses downstream of the discharge are municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply, including stock watering; industrial service supply; hydropower generation; water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting; non-contact water recreation, including aesthetic enjoyment; commercial and sport fishing; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; warm migration of aquatic organisms; cold migration of aquatic organisms; warm spawning, reproduction, and/or early development; cold spawning, reproduction, and /or early development; wildlife habitat; and navigation.
- b. **Hardness.** While no effluent limitation for hardness is necessary in this Order, hardness is critical to the assessment of the need for, and the development of, effluent limitations for certain metals. The *California Toxics Rule*, at (c)(4), states

the following:

*“Application of metals criteria. (i) For purposes of calculating freshwater aquatic life criteria for metals from the equations in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L or less as calcium carbonate, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water shall be used in those equations.”*  
[emphasis added]

The State Water Board, in footnote 19 to Water Quality Order No. 2004-0013, stated: *“We note that...the Regional Water Board...applied a variable hardness value whereby effluent limitations will vary depending on the actual, current hardness values in the receiving water. We recommend that the Regional Water Board establish either fixed or seasonal effluent limitations for metals, as provided in the SIP, rather than ‘floating’ effluent limitations.”*

Effluent limitations for the discharge must be set to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water for all discharge conditions. In the absence of the option of including condition-dependent, “floating” effluent limitations that are reflective of actual conditions at the time of discharge, effluent limitations must be set using a reasonable worst-case condition in order to protect beneficial uses for all discharge conditions. For purposes of establishing water quality-based effluent limitations, a reported hardness value of 72 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> and a pH value of 6.6 were used. The values are the minimum observed hardness and pH value based on 20 samples collected from the effluent from January 2003 through April 2007. A receiving water hardness value of 44 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> was utilized for establishing water quality criteria for acute cadmium, silver, and lead, and chronic lead. The receiving water hardness value was based on the minimum observed hardness in 28 receiving water samples collected from June 2004 through November 2006.

- c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.** The CWA directs states to adopt water quality standards to protect the quality of its waters. USEPA’s current water quality standards regulation authorizes states to adopt general policies, such as for mixing zones, to implement state water quality standards (40 CFR section 122.44 and section 122.45). The USEPA allows states to have broad flexibility in designing its mixing zone policies. Primary policy and guidance on determining mixing zone and dilution credits is provided by the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP), the USEPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control (EPA/505/2-90-001) (TSD), and the Basin Plan. For NPDES permits in California, the SIP policy supersedes the USEPA guidance for priority pollutants, to the extent that it addresses a particular procedure. The SIP does not apply to non-priority pollutants, in which case the more stringent of the Basin Plan or USEPA guidance applies.

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.”*

Section 1.4.2 of the SIP states, in part, *“...with the exception of effluent limitations derived from TMDLs, 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 throughout 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.”*

Section 1.4.2.1 of the SIP defines a dilution credit as, *“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. 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 a discharge.”*

Regarding mixing zones, the SIP states, *“A mixing zone shall be as small as practicable. The following conditions must be met in allowing a mixing zone:*

*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 No. 88-63), this SIP supersedes the provisions of that policy."

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.

The Discharger submitted a Mixing Zone Study on 7 June 2006. The Mixing Zone Study utilized the numeric Cornell Mixing Zone Expert System (CORMIX) computer model to calculate dilution of effluent downstream from the point of discharge into the receiving water. Supplemental to the CORMIX modeling the Discharger performed a dye study on 27 January 2006 to provide a comparison to the modeling results. The results of the Mixing Zone Study are provided in Table F-5.

**Table F-5. Anderson WPCP Mixing Zone Study Results**

Distance Downstream (feet)	Acute		Chronic		Human Health	
	Centerline Dilution	Mixing (%)	Centerline Dilution	Mixing (%)	Centerline Dilution	Mixing (%)
200	9:1	3.0	22:1	2.3	110:1	3.2
400	12:1	3.8	28:1	3.0	152:1	4.4
600	14:1	4.5	33:1	3.5	185:1	5.3
800	16:1	5.1	38:1	4.0	212:1	6.1

- d. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Acute Aquatic Life Criteria.** The SIP requires that if a year-round dilution credit is to be considered for establishing effluent limitations for priority pollutants regulated under the California Toxics Rule (CTR), critical receiving water flow and maximum discharged effluent flows must be evaluated as part of the dilution calculation. For acute aquatic life criteria, the SIP

requires an evaluation of the lowest one-day receiving water flow with a statistical frequency of once every 10 years (1Q10) compared against the maximum daily effluent flow during the discharge period. Based on information provided by the Discharger in the Mixing Zone Study, the 1Q10 flow rate of the Sacramento River at the Anderson Water Pollution Control Facility is **2,847** cfs. The 1Q10 value was calculated using receiving water flow data from 1965 through 2003. The Mixing Zone Study utilized the Facility maximum wet-weather day design flow of 6.0 mgd as the “maximum daily effluent flow during the discharge period.” However, the maximum daily effluent flow during the period of January 2003 through May 2007 was 4.0 MGD, which occurred on 30 December 2005. A summary of available dilution for specific criteria, as utilized in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study, is included in Table F-6

- e. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Chronic Aquatic Life Criteria.** The TSD states that: *“Concentrations above the chronic criteria are likely to prevent sensitive taxa from taking up long-term residence in the mixing zone. In this regard, benthic organisms and territorial organisms are likely to be of greatest concern. The higher the concentration occurring within the isopleths, the more taxa are likely to be excluded, thereby affecting the structure and function of the ecological community. It is thus important to minimize the overall size of the mixing zone and the size of elevated concentration isopleths within the mixing zone.”*

For the determination of a year-round chronic aquatic life criteria dilution credit, the SIP requires an evaluation of the lowest seven (7) consecutive day receiving water flows with a statistical frequency of once every 10 years (7Q10) compared against the four-day average of daily maximum effluent discharge flows during the discharge period. Based on information provided by the Discharger in the Mixing Zone Study, the 7Q10 flow rate in the receiving water is **2,934** cfs. The 7Q10 value was calculated using receiving water flow data from 1965 through 2003. The Mixing Zone Study utilized the Facility design dry-weather maximum flow of 2.0 MGD as the “four-day average of daily maximum effluent discharge flows during the discharge period.” However, the four-day average of daily maximum effluent discharge flows during the period of January 2003 through May 2007 was 3.8 MGD, which occurred between 30 December 2005 and 2 January 2006. A summary of available dilution for specific criteria, as utilized in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study, is included in Table F-6.

- f. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Priority Pollutant Human Health Criteria.** The human health-based criteria for carcinogens, other than arsenic, are based on safe levels for lifetime exposure and dilution is based on the harmonic mean flow of the receiving water. In determining the available receiving water dilution for compliance with human carcinogen criteria, the SIP, section 1.4.2.1 requires that the harmonic mean of the receiving water flow be compared against the arithmetic mean of the effluent flow of the observed discharge period. Based on information provided by the Discharger in the Mixing Zone Study, the harmonic mean flow rate in the receiving water is **7,549** cfs. The harmonic mean value was calculated using receiving water flow data from 1965 through 2003. The Mixing Zone Study utilized the Facility monthly average dry weather flow of 1.4 MGD as the “arithmetic mean of

the effluent flow of the observed discharge period.” However, the observed average effluent flow from the Facility, including both the wet and dry periods, from January 2003 through May 2007 is 1.5 MGD. A summary of available dilution for specific criteria, as utilized in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study, is included in Table F-6.

**g. Evaluation of Available Dilution for Pathogen/Disinfection Considerations.**

The Sacramento River has the designated beneficial use of drinking water/municipal supply and must be protected for that use. For agricultural use and body contact recreational uses, the impacts to human health can result from very short exposures and can occur at or near the outfall. The quality of the discharge must be protective of drinking water/municipal supply, body contact recreation, and agricultural supply within as short a distance downstream of the outfall as possible. In a letter to the Central Valley Water Board dated April 8, 1999, the California Department of Health Services (DHS) indicated that they would consider wastewater discharged to water bodies with identified beneficial uses of irrigation and contact recreation to be adequately disinfected if: 1) the wastewater receives dilution of more than 20:1; 2) the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median; and 3) effluent coliform density does not exceed 240 MPN/100 mL more than once in any 30 day period. Municipal water supply is a beneficial use of the Sacramento River, as noted above. DHS recommends that samples be obtained for coliform at least twice per week if this coliform effluent limitation is used. This Order implements the DHS guidance. Furthermore, there is nearly **307:1 dilution** available under the most critical conditions.

A summary of available dilution for specific criteria, as utilized in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study, is included in Table F-6.

**Table F-6. Dilution Ratios Utilized in Mixing Zone Study**

Dilution Ratio for:	Critical Receiving Water Flow <sup>1</sup> (cfs)	Discharge Effluent Flow <sup>2</sup> (MGD)	Dilution Ratio
Acute aquatic life criteria/objectives	<u>1Q10</u> <b>2,847</b>	Maximum daily flow during period of discharge <b>6.0</b>	<b>307:1</b>
Chronic aquatic life criteria/objectives Chronic toxicity objectives for aquatic life	<u>7Q10</u> <b>2,934</b>	4-day average of daily maximum flows during period of discharge <b>2.0</b>	<b>948:1</b>
Human Health criteria/objectives	<u>Harmonic Mean</u> <b>7,549</b>	Long-term arithmetic mean flow during period of discharge <b>1.4</b>	<b>3485:1</b>

<sup>1</sup> Data period: Yrs. 1965 - 2003, USGS 11370500 Sacramento River at Keswick and 11372000 Clear Creek at Igo.

<sup>2</sup> Flows do not match observed effluent flow values for the discharge period of January 2003 through May 2007.

Although the effluent flow data utilized in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study varies from observed effluent flow conditions, the dilution ratios appear adequate. The dilution ratio for acute criteria is conservative as the Mixing Zone Study utilized the design maximum flow for the Facility (6.0 MGD) as opposed to the observed maximum for the past four years, 4.0 MGD. The dilution ratio for chronic criteria was underestimated as the Mixing Zone Study utilized the design average dry weather flow of 2.0 MGD as opposed to the observed 4-day maximum of 3.8 MGD. The dilution ratio for human health criteria is appropriate, as the difference between 1.4 MGD and 1.5 MGD as a long-term arithmetic mean flow is negligible. This Order requires the Discharger to submit a dilution credit justification update 1 year prior to the expiration of the Order. Dilution ratios for specific criteria shall be analyzed with both design and observed effluent flow data.

- h. **Mixing Zone and Dilution Credit.** The dilution credit at 200 feet downstream of the discharge, established in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study, was utilized for each criterion. Since the facility should be able to meet final effluent limitations for all constituents with reasonable potential at 200 feet downstream of the discharge, further distances, with greater dilutions credits, were not considered.

The WQBEL calculations and assumption methodology utilized in this Order does differ from previous Orders for NPDES facilities that share the same receiving water and are located within a close proximity to the discharge. Previously, the Regional Board has allowed the use of one upstream receiving water monitoring location (at Caldwell Park) for background CTR constituents for these subject NPDES facilities. To account for only one background monitoring point, the Regional Board set allocation factors ranging from 1/6 to 1/5 to each discharger for use in the WQBEL calculation. These factors were considered a conservative element to apply to the calculation of the site specific WQBEL in light of the use of sharing one background monitoring location and the lack of site-specific mixing zone studies. At this point, the Regional Board has decided to use the dilution credits provided in the Anderson Mixing Zone Study without the addition of a river allocation factor being applied. The Regional Board is requiring receiving water monitoring for CTR constituents immediately upstream of the Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant in order to analyze site-specific background conditions and to determine whether an allocation factor is necessary in the subject reach.

- i. **Site-Specific Translators.** The Discharger has requested the use of the site-specific metals translators developed by the City of Redding in 2007 for this reach of the Sacramento River. The proposed metals translators were most recently utilized in the development of total copper and zinc criteria for the Stillwater Wastewater Treatment Facility. The Stillwater Facility discharges effluent to the Sacramento River approximately 3,000 feet downstream of the effluent discharge location for the Anderson Water Pollution Control Plant. The proposed metals translators are based on monthly receiving water data, collected from the Sacramento River at Caldwell Park, since May 2004 (after the installation of Slickrock Creek Dam). This Order includes monitoring for downstream receiving water total and dissolved copper and

zinc levels for comparison to the total to dissolved ratios achieved at the Caldwell Park monitoring location.

The following site-specific translators have been used in the Order to reflect current conditions:

	<u>Chronic</u>	<u>Acute</u>
<b>Copper</b>	0.771	0.811
<b>Zinc</b>	0.705	0.766

### 3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

- a. CWA section 301 (b)(1) requires NPDES permits to include effluent limitations that achieve technology-based standards and any more stringent limitations necessary to meet water quality standards. Water quality standards include Regional Water Board Basin Plan beneficial uses and narrative and numeric water quality objectives, State Water Board-adopted standards, and federal standards, including the CTR and NTR. The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, 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.) With regards to the narrative chemical constituents objective, the Basin Plan 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 (MCLs)”* in Title 22 of CCR. 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.”*
  
- b. Federal regulations require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numerical water quality standard. Based on information submitted as part of the application, in studies, and as directed by monitoring and reporting programs, the Regional 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, zinc, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and beta-BHC. Water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the reasonable potential analysis (RPA) for inorganic CTR parameters is provided in Table F-7. Table F-8 provides a summary of the

organic compounds with reasonable potential. Applicable priority pollutant water quality criteria and objectives for parameters with reasonable potential are included in Table F-9. A detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

- c. The Regional Water Board conducted the RPA in accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP. Although the SIP applies directly to the control of CTR priority pollutants, the State Water Board has held that the Regional Water Board may use the SIP as guidance for water quality-based toxics control.<sup>1</sup> The SIP states in the introduction “*The goal of this Policy is to establish a standardized approach for permitting discharges of toxic pollutants to non-ocean surface waters in a manner that promotes statewide consistency.*” Therefore, in this Order the RPA procedures from the SIP were used to evaluate reasonable potential for both CTR and non-CTR constituents.
- d. WQBELs were calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP, as described in Attachment F, Section IV.C.4.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, Order WQO 2001-16 (Napa) and Order WQO 2004-0013 (Yuba City)

**Table F-7. Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis for Inorganics**

Parameter (ug/L)	Effluent Sample 7/2003	Effluent Sample 6/2004	Effluent Sample 8/2005	Effluent Sample 8/2006	MEC	BC	Applicable Hardness Value (mg/L)	Most Stringent Applicable Criteria	Reasonable Potential?
Antimony	<0.02	0.2 J	0.2 J	0.2 J	0.2	0.035	n/a	6	No
Arsenic	<0.1	0.4 J	<0.1	0.6	0.6	1.76	n/a	10	No
Beryllium	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.100	0.02	n/a	4	No
Cadmium	0.06 DNQ	<0.05	<0.06	0.08 J	0.08	0.054	44	0.26	No
Chromium (III)	0.2 DNQ	<0.1	1.5	<1.0	1.5	0.86	72	158.2	No
Chromium (VI)	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	2	10	n/a	11.4	No
Copper	8.8	3.1	6.3	6	8.8	4.01	72	8.8	No
Lead	0.4 DNQ	0.2 J	0.2 J	0.4 J	0.4	0.241	44	1.12	No
Mercury	0.00667	0.00241	0.00255	0.00214	0.00667	0.00656	n/a	0.05	No
Nickel	1	0.9 J	1.2	1.4	1.2	3.6	72	39.5	No
Selenium	<0.2	<0.4	<0.5	<0.4	0.2	0.44	n/a	5	No
Silver	<0.25	<0.1	<0.12	<0.12	0.1	0.059	44	0.99	No
Thallium	<0.01	<0.2	<0.2	<0.2	0.01	0.004	n/a	1.7	No
Zinc	38	28.2	32.7	47.6	47.6	7.5	72	34.1	Yes
Cyanide	3 DNQ	<3.0	<2.0	<2.0	3	0.003	n/a	5.2	No

DNQ and J: "Lab detected but not quantified."

MEC: Maximum Effluent Concentration. If all samples values are non-detect then MEC equals lowest detection limit.

BC: Maximum Background Concentration. Receiving water data from Sacramento River at Caldwell Park monitoring station. Dates include January 2003 through March 2007. If all samples values are non-detect then BC equals lowest detection limit.

Lowest effluent hardness value is 72 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> and lowest receiving water hardness value is 44 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.

n/a: Not Applicable.

**Table F-8. Summary of Organic Compounds with Reasonable Potential**

Parameter (ug/L)	Effluent Sample 7/2003	Effluent Sample 6/2004	Effluent Sample 8/2005	Effluent Sample 8/2006	Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC)	Background Concentration (BC)	Most Stringent Applicable Criteria
Chlorodibromomethane	0.9	0.5	0.4 J	0.1J	0.9	0.15	0.41
Dichlorobromomethane	5.4	8.2	3.2	0.07 J	8.2	0.17	0.56
beta-BHC	<0.002	0.029	<0.002	<0.002	0.029	0.0018	0.005

J: Lab detected but not quantified.

**Table F-9. Summary of Applicable Priority Pollutant Criterion/Objectives**

Parameter	Units	CTR Water Quality Criteria				Basin Plan	Most Stringent Applicable Criterion (C)	
		Freshwater		Human Health for consumption of:			Value	Criterion
		CMC (acute)	CCC (chronic)	Water & Organisms (W&O)	Organisms Only	Max (acute)		
Zinc <sup>1</sup>	ug/l	116.2	126.2	--	--	34.1	34.1	BP Max-Acute
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/l	--	--	0.410	34	--	0.410	CTR HH- (W&O)
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/l	--	--	0.560	46	--	0.560	CTR HH- (W&O)
beta-BHC	ug/l	--	--	0.014	0.046	ND (ML= 0.005)	0.005	BP Objective

<sup>1</sup> Based on effluent hardness of 72 mg/L and site-specific translators (chronic: 0.705, acute: 0.766).

CTR = California Toxic Rule

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (acute)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (chronic)

ML= Minimum quantifiable level required by Appendix 4 of the SIP.

- e. **Ammonia.** Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia. 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. 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 would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Applying 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(B), it is appropriate to use USEPA's Ambient National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life for ammonia, which was developed to be protective of aquatic organisms.

USEPA's *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life*, for total ammonia, recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average, criteria continuous concentration) standards based on pH and temperature. It also recommends a maximum four-day average concentration of 2.5 times the criteria continuous concentration. USEPA 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 in the Sacramento River is well-documented, the recommended criteria for waters where salmonids and early life stages are present were used. USEPA's recommended criteria are show below:

$$CCC_{30\text{-day}} = \left( \frac{0.0577}{1 + 10^{7.688 - pH}} + \frac{2.487}{1 + 10^{pH - 7.688}} \right) \times \text{MIN}(2.85, 1.45 \cdot 10^{0.028(25 - T)}), \text{ and}$$

$$CMC = \left( \frac{0.275}{1 + 10^{7.204 - pH}} + \frac{39.0}{1 + 10^{pH - 7.204}} \right),$$

where  $T$  is in degrees Celsius

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 9.0. The maximum historical effluent pH is 8.1. The Basin Plan objective for pH in the receiving stream is the range of 6.5 to 8.5. The maximum observed 30-day average effluent temperature was 80°F (26.5°C), for the period of January 2003 through May 2007 and occurred on the 30-day period ending in July 2006. The maximum observed 30-day background receiving water temperature for the period of January 2003 through May 2007 was 57.3°F (14.1°C), for the 30-day period ending 30 June 2005. Using a pH value of 9.0 and the worst-case receiving water temperature value of 57.3°F (14.1°C) on a 30-day basis, the resulting effluent limitations are 0.486 mg/L (as N) for the average monthly effluent limitation and 0.885 mg/L (as N) for the average one-hour effluent limitation. The maximum observed daily pH value for

effluent during the period of January 2003 through May 2007 occurred on 5 October 2004 and was reported as 8.1. Analyzing the effluent pH value data set of 53 monthly maximum pH values, yields a mean pH value of 7.51 and a standard deviation of 0.19. Therefore, the 99 percent confidence interval for maximum daily pH values is 7.47 to 7.56. The maximum pH value of 8.1 falls outside the 99 percent confidence interval for the Facility's historic effluent pH values could be considered an appropriate pH value to use in establishing ammonia criteria. However, to ensure that the ammonia effluent limitation will be protective in all situations allowed by this Order, the maximum allowed pH value of 9.0 has been used. Using the maximum pH value of 9.0 and the worst-case temperature value of 57.3°F (14.1°C) on a 30-day basis, the resulting ammonia criteria are 0.486 mg/L (as N) for the average monthly criteria and 0.885 mg/L (as N) for the average one-hour criteria.

The maximum effluent concentration for ammonia was 2.83 mg/L, based on 18 samples collected between January 2003 and May 2007. However, the average ammonia concentration for the above period of time was 0.62 mg/L with a median value of 0.17 mg/L. There is no background receiving water ammonia sample results. The maximum observed ammonia effluent concentration does exceed both the acute and chronic criteria for ammonia utilizing the maximum pH of 9.0. Therefore there is reasonable potential for ammonia and effluent limits for ammonia are included in this Order.

The ambient ammonia concentration in the receiving water is assumed to be zero. A dilution credit for ammonia of up to 9:1 can be granted, based on the acute freshwater aquatic life criteria (see Attachment F, Section IV.4) and the results of the Mixing Zone Study at 200 feet downstream of the discharge. An AMEL and MDEL for ammonia of 3.2 ug/L and 9.0 ug/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on based on the USEPA criterion for the protection of aquatic life (See Attachment F, Table F-11 for WQBEL calculations). Based on the sample results in the effluent, it appears the Discharger can meet these new limitations.

- f. **Chlorine Residual.** The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. The Discharger uses a sulfur dioxide process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to the Sacramento River. Due to the existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

The USEPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (four-day) and acute (one-hour) aquatic life criteria to average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations 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 one-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. Average one-hour and four-day limitations for chlorine, based on

these criteria, are included in this Order. The Discharger can immediately comply with these new effluent limitations for chlorine residual.

The Facility discharges through a diffuser to Sacramento River. The chlorine residual limitations required in this Order are protective of aquatic organisms in the undiluted discharge. If compliance is maintained, the Regional Water Board does not anticipate residual chlorine impacts to benthic organisms.

- g. **Chlorodibromomethane.** The CTR includes a chlorodibromomethane criterion of 0.41 ug/L for the protection of human health and is based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed. The MEC for chlorodibromomethane was 0.9 ug/L, based on 4 samples collected between 8 July 2003 and 1 August 2006, while the maximum observed upstream receiving water chlorodibromomethane concentration was <0.15 ug/L, based on 2 samples collected between 12 September 2006 and 1 November 2006. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for chlorodibromomethane.

The ambient monitoring demonstrates the receiving water has assimilative capacity for chlorodibromomethane. A dilution credit for chlorodibromomethane of up to 110:1 can be granted, based on the available human health dilution (see Attachment F, Section IV.4) and the results of the Mixing Zone Study at 200 feet downstream of the discharge. An AMEL and MDEL for chlorodibromomethane of 29 ug/L and 58.2 ug/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health (See Attachment F, Table F-12 for WQBEL calculations). Based on the sample results in the effluent, it appears the Discharger can meet these new limitations.

- h. **Dichlorobromomethane.** The CTR includes a dichlorobromomethane criterion of 0.56 ug/L for the protection of human health and is based on a one-in-a-million cancer risk for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed. The MEC for dichlorobromomethane was 8.2 ug/L, based on 4 samples collected between 8 July 2003 and 1 August 2006, while the maximum observed upstream receiving water dichlorobromomethane concentration was <0.17 ug/L, based on 2 samples collected between 12 September 2006 and 1 November 2006. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for dichlorobromomethane.

The ambient monitoring demonstrates the receiving water has assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane. A dilution credit for dichlorobromomethane of up to 110:1 can be granted, based on the available human health dilution (see Attachment F, Section IV.4) and the results of the Mixing Zone Study at 200 feet downstream of the discharge. An AMEL and MDEL for dichlorobromomethane of 43.5 ug/L and 87.2 ug/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health (See Attachment F, Table F-13 for WQBEL calculations). Based on the sample results in the effluent, it appears the Discharger can meet these new limitations.

- i. **Electrical Conductivity. (see Subsection o. Salinity)**
- j. **Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides.** beta-BHC was detected in the effluent in concentration as high as 0.029 ug/L. This constituent is a chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticide. The Basin Plan requires that no individual pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses; total chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides shall not be present in the water column at detectable concentrations; and pesticide concentrations shall not exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies. The CTR contains a numeric criteria for beta-BHC of 0.014 ug/L for freshwaters from which both water and organisms are consumed. The detection of beta-BHC at 0.029 ug/L in the effluent presents a reasonable potential to exceed the Basin Plan limitations for chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides and the CTR criteria for beta-BHC. Receiving water limitations for persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective of no detectable concentrations of chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides.

The ambient monitoring demonstrates the receiving water has assimilative capacity for beta-BHC. A dilution credit for beta-BHC of up to 22:1 can be granted, based on the available chronic freshwater aquatic life dilution (see Attachment F, Section IV.4) and the results of the Mixing Zone Study at 200 feet downstream of the discharge. An AMEL and MDEL for beta-BHC of 0.06 ug/L and 0.12 ug/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on the Basin Plan objective of “non-detect” and the minimum quantifiable level (ML) required by Appendix 4 of the SIP (See Attachment F, Table F-14 for WQBEL calculations). Based on the sample results in the effluent, it appears the Discharger can meet these new limitations.

- k. **Pathogens.** Municipal and domestic supply, agricultural irrigation, and body contact water recreation are beneficial uses of the receiving stream. Coliform limits are imposed to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water, including public health through contact recreation and drinking water pathways. In a letter to the Regional Water Board dated 8 April 1999, the California Department of Health Services indicated that DHS 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. This Order contains a 240 MPN/100mL daily maximum effluent coliform limit and a 23 MPN/100mL as a 30-day median.
- l. **pH.** 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. Changes in normal ambient pH levels shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh

waters with designated COLD or WARM beneficial uses.” Effluent Limitations for pH are included in this Order based on the Basin Plan objectives for pH.

- m. **Salinity.** The discharge contains total dissolved solids (TDS) and electrical conductivity (EC). These are water quality parameters that are indicative of the salinity of the water. Their presence in water can be growth limiting to certain agricultural crops and can affect the taste of water for human consumption. There are no USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic organisms for these constituents. The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates State MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for EC and TDS.

**Table F-10. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives**

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Goal <sup>1</sup>	Secondary MCL <sup>3</sup>	Effluent	
			Avg	Max
EC (µmhos/cm)	Varies <sup>2</sup>	900, 1600, 2200	366	483
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	234	273
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	N/A
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	N/A

- 1 Agricultural water quality goals based on *Water Quality for Agriculture*, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985).
- 2 The EC level in irrigation water that harms crop production depends on the crop type, soil type, irrigation methods, rainfall, and other factors. An EC level of 700 umhos/cm is generally considered to present no risk of salinity impacts to crops. However, many crops are grown successfully with higher salinities.
- 3 The secondary MCLs are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.

- i. **Electrical Conductivity (EC).** The secondary MCL for EC is 900 µmhos/cm as a recommended level, 1600 µmhos/cm as an upper level, and 2200 µmhos/cm as a short-term maximum. The agricultural water quality goal, that would apply the narrative chemical constituents objective, is 700 µmhos/cm as a long-term average based on *Water Quality for Agriculture*, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985). The 700 µmhos/cm agricultural water quality goal is intended to prevent reduction in crop yield, i.e. a restriction on use of water, for salt-sensitive crops, such as beans, carrots, turnips, and strawberries. Most other crops can tolerate higher EC concentrations without harm, however, as the salinity of the irrigation water increases, more crops are potentially harmed by the EC, or extra measures must be taken by the farmer to minimize or eliminate any harmful impacts.

A review of the Discharger’s monitoring reports from January 2003 through May 2007 shows an average monthly effluent EC of 366 umhos/cm, a one-day maximum observed EC of 483 umhos/cm, and an average monthly range from 276 umhos/cm to 483 umhos/cm for 52 samples. These levels do not

exceed the applicable water quality objectives. There is no background receiving water EC sample results. This Order requires effluent and receiving water monitoring for EC.

- ii. **Total Dissolved Solids (TDS).** The secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum. The recommended agricultural water quality goal for TDS, that would apply the narrative chemical constituent objective, is 450 mg/L as a long-term average based on Water Quality for Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 29, Rev. 1 (R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot, Rome, 1985). Water Quality for Agriculture evaluates the impacts of salinity levels on crop tolerance and yield reduction, and establishes water quality goals that are protective of the agricultural uses. The 450 mg/L water quality goal is intended to prevent reduction in crop yield, i.e. a restriction on use of water, for salt-sensitive crops. Only the most salt sensitive crops require irrigation water of 450 mg/L or less to prevent loss of yield. Most other crops can tolerate higher TDS concentrations without harm, however, as the salinity of the irrigation water increases, more crops are potentially harmed by the TDS, or extra measures must be taken by the farmer to minimize or eliminate any harmful impacts.

The average TDS effluent concentration was 234 mg/L and ranged from 196 mg/L to 273 mg/L for 18 samples collected by the Discharger from January 2003 through May 2007. These concentrations do not exceed the applicable water quality objectives. There are no background receiving water TDS sample results.

- iii. **Salinity Effluent Limitations and Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The average electrical conductivity in the discharge is 366 umhos/cm, which is less than the lowest applicable criteria of 700 umhos/cm (agricultural water quality goal). No reasonable potential exists, therefore no effluent limitation is necessary. Nonetheless, in an effort to minimize salt loading to the Sacramento River, this Order requires the Discharger to submit a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the Facility.
- n. **Settleable Solids.** 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.” This Order does not contain average monthly and average daily effluent limitations for settleable solids. With total suspended solids limits in place, the settleable solids limits can be eliminated and still protect water quality objectives in the receiving water.
- o. **Toxicity.** See Section IV.C.5. of the Fact Sheet regarding whole effluent toxicity.

- p. **Zinc.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. The criteria for zinc are presented in dissolved concentrations. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The conversion factors for zinc in freshwater are 0.978 for the acute criteria and 0.986 for the chronic criteria. Using the worst-case ambient (lowest upstream receiving water) measured hardness from the effluent (72 mg/L), the applicable chronic criterion (maximum four-day average concentration) and the applicable acute criterion (maximum one-hour average concentration) are both 91 ug/L, as total recoverable. Applying the site-specific translator for zinc of 0.705 for the chronic criteria and 0.766 for the acute criteria, the applicable chronic criterion (maximum four-day average concentration) is 126.2 ug/L and the applicable acute criterion (maximum one-hour average concentration) is 116.2 ug/L, as total recoverable.

The Basin Plan also includes hardness-dependent objectives for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. Using the worst-case measured hardness from the effluent (72 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) and the USEPA recommended dissolved-to-total translator, the applicable Basin Plan instantaneous maximum criterion is 26.1 ug/L, as total recoverable. Applying the site-specific translator for zinc of 0.766 for the acute criteria, the applicable acute criterion (maximum one-hour average concentration) is 34.1 ug/L, as total recoverable.

The MEC for total zinc was 47.6 ug/L, based on 4 samples collected between 8 July 2003 and 1 August 2006, while the maximum observed upstream receiving water total zinc concentration was 7.5 ug/L, based on 28 samples collected between 17 June 2004 and 1 November 2006. Therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan objective for zinc. A dilution credit for zinc of up to 9:1 can be granted, based on the available freshwater acute life criteria (see Attachment F, Section IV.4) and the results of the Mixing Zone Study at 200 feet downstream of the discharge. An AMEL and MDEL for total zinc of 139 ug/L and 279 ug/L, respectively, are included in this Order based on Basin Plan criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life (See Attachment F, Table F-15 for WQBEL calculations). Based on the sample results in the effluent, it appears the Discharger can meet the MDEL and AMEL for zinc.

#### 4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. Effluent limitations for ammonia, zinc, chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and beta-BHC were calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The following paragraphs describe the methodology used for calculating effluent limitations.
- b. **Effluent Limitation Calculations.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the effluent concentration allowance was calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation:

$$ECA = C + D(C - B) \quad \text{when } C > B, \text{ and}$$

$$ECA = C \quad \text{when } C \leq B$$

where:

- $ECA_{acute}$  = effluent concentration allowance for acute (one-hour average) toxicity criterion, adjusted, if necessary, for hardness, pH, and translators.
- $ECA_{chronic}$  = effluent concentration allowance for chronic (four-day average) toxicity criterion adjusted, if necessary, for hardness, pH, and translators.
- $ECA_{HH}$  = effluent concentration allowance for human health, or other long-term criterion/objective

- C = human health, aquatic life, or other long-term criterion/objective
- D = dilution credit (dilution ratio \* estimated mixing)
- B = maximum receiving water concentration

Acute and chronic toxicity ECAs were then converted to equivalent long-term averages (LTA) using statistical multipliers and the lowest is used. Additional statistical multipliers were then used to calculate the maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) and the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL).

Human health ECAs are set equal to the AMEL and a statistical multiplier is used to calculate the MDEL.

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

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

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

- where:  $mult_{AMEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL
- $mult_{MDEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL
- $M_A$  = statistical multiplier converting  $ECA_{acute}$  to LTA
- $M_C$  = statistical multiplier converting  $ECA_{chronic}$  to LTA

Water quality-based effluent limitations were calculated for ammonia, zinc, dichlorobromomethane, chlorodibromomethane, and beta-BHC as follows in Tables F-11 through F-15, below.

**Table F-11. WQBEL Calculations for Ammonia**

	Acute	Chronic
Criteria (mg/L)	0.885 <sup>(1)</sup>	0.486 <sup>(2)</sup>
Dilution Credit <sup>(3)</sup>	9:1	22:1
ECA <sup>(4)</sup>	9.0	11.1
ECA Multiplier <sup>(5)</sup>	0.151	0.277
LTA	1.46	3.1
AMEL Multiplier (95 <sup>th</sup> %) <sup>(6)(7)</sup>	2.33	<sup>(9)</sup>
<b>AMEL (mg/L)</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<sup>(9)</sup>
MDEL Multiplier (99 <sup>th</sup> %) <sup>(8)</sup>	6.6	<sup>(9)</sup>
<b>MDEL (mg/L)</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<sup>(9)</sup>

- (1) USEPA aquatic life criteria, based on an effluent pH value of 9.0.
- (2) USEPA aquatic life criteria, based on an effluent pH value of 9.0 and a receiving water temperature value of 14°C.
- (3) Estimated Mixing at 200 feet downstream of discharge.
- (4) ECA calculated per section 1.4.B, Step 2 of SIP. This allows for the consideration of dilution.
- (5) Acute and Chronic ECA Multiplier calculated at 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 3 of SIP or per sections 5.4.1 and 5.5.4 of the TSD. Coefficient of variation is equal to 1.42
- (6) Assumes sampling frequency n=>4.
- (7) The probability basis for AMEL is 95th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP or section 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- (8) The probability basis for MDEL is 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP or section 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- (9) Limitations based on acute LTA (Acute LTA < Chronic LTA).

**Table F-12. WQBEL Calculations for Chlorodibromomethane**

	Human Health
Criteria (ug/L)	0.41
Dilution Credit <sup>(1)</sup>	110:1
ECA	29.01
<b>AMEL (ug/L) <sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>29</b>
MDEL/AMEL Multiplier <sup>(3)</sup>	2.01
<b>MDEL (ug/L)</b>	<b>58.2</b>

- (1) Estimated Mixing at 200 feet downstream of discharge of 3.2%.
- (2) AMEL = ECA per section 1.4.B, Step 6 of SIP
- (3) Assumes sampling frequency n<=4. Uses MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of SIP.

**Table F-13. WQBEL Calculations for Dichlorobromomethane**

	Human Health
Criteria (ug/L)	0.56
Dilution Credit <sup>(1)</sup>	110:1
ECA	43.5
<b>AMEL (ug/L) <sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>43.5</b>
MDEL/AMEL Multiplier <sup>(3)</sup>	2.01
<b>MDEL (ug/L)</b>	<b>87.2</b>

- (1) Estimated Mixing at 200 feet downstream of discharge of 3.2%.
- (2) AMEL = ECA per section 1.4.B, Step 6 of SIP
- (3) Assumes sampling frequency n<=4. Uses MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of SIP.

**Table F-14. WQBEL Calculations for beta-BHC**

	Basin Plan	Human Health
Criteria (ug/L)	0.005 <sup>(1)</sup>	0.014 <sup>(2)</sup>
Dilution Credit <sup>(3)</sup>	22:1	110:1
ECA <sup>(4)</sup>	0.07	1.36
ECA Multiplier <sup>(5)</sup>	0.527	--
LTA	0.04	--
AMEL Multiplier (95 <sup>th</sup> %) <sup>(6)(7)</sup>	1.55	--
<b>AMEL (ug/L)</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>1.36<sup>(9)</sup></b>
MDEL Multiplier (99 <sup>th</sup> %) <sup>(8)</sup>	3.11	2.01
<b>MDEL (ug/L)</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>2.72<sup>(9)</sup></b>

- (1) Basin Plan objective, based on minimum quantifiable level required by Appendix 4 of the SIP.
- (2) CTR human health criteria.
- (3) Estimated Mixing at 200 feet downstream of discharge.
- (4) ECA calculated per section 1.4.B, Step 2 of SIP. This allows for the consideration of dilution.
- (5) Chronic ECA Multiplier calculated at 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 3 of SIP or per sections 5.4.1 and 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- (6) Assumes sampling frequency n=>4.
- (7) The probability basis for AMEL is 95th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP or section 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- (8) The probability basis for MDEL is 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP or section 5.5.4 of the TSD
- (9) Limitations based on chronic LTA (Basin Plan objective < CTR Human Health Criteria).

**Table F-15. WQBEL Calculations for Zinc**

	Acute	Chronic
Criteria, <b>total</b> (ug/L)	34.1 <sup>(1)</sup>	126.2 <sup>(2)</sup>
Dilution Credit <sup>(3)</sup>	9:1	22:1
Translator <sup>(4)</sup>	0.766	0.705
ECA, total recoverable <sup>(5)</sup>	278.8	2714.7
ECA Multiplier <sup>(6)</sup>	0.321	0.527
LTA	89.5	1431.8
AMEL Multiplier (95 <sup>th</sup> %) <sup>(7)(8)</sup>	1.55	<sup>(10)</sup>
<b>AMEL (ug/L)</b>	<b>139</b>	<b><sup>(10)</sup></b>
MDEL Multiplier (99 <sup>th</sup> %) <sup>(9)</sup>	3.11	<sup>(10)</sup>
<b>MDEL (ug/L)</b>	<b>279</b>	<b><sup>(10)</sup></b>

- (1) Basin Plan aquatic life criteria, based on a effluent hardness of 72 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> and site- specific translator for acute conditions of 0.766.
- (2) CTR aquatic life criteria, based on a effluent hardness of 72 mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub> and site- specific translator for chronic conditions of 0.705.
- (3) Estimated Mixing at 200 feet downstream of discharge.
- (4) Site-Specific Translator.
- (5) ECA calculated per section 1.4.B, Step 2 of SIP. This allows for the consideration of dilution.
- (6) Acute and Chronic ECA Multiplier calculated at 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 3 of SIP or per sections 5.4.1 and 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- (7) Assumes sampling frequency n=>4.
- (8) The probability basis for AMEL is 95th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP or section 5.5.4 of the TSD.
- (9) The probability basis for MDEL is 99th percentile per section 1.4.B, Step 5 of SIP or section 5.5.4 of the TSD
- (10) Limitations based on acute LTA (Acute LTA < Chronic LTA).

### 5. Summary of Water Quality-based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-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
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>						
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>						
Zinc	ug/L	139	--	279		
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/L	29	--	58.2		
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/L	43.5	--	87.2		
beta-BHC	ug/L	0.06	--	0.12		
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>						
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	--	0.01 <sup>(1)</sup>	--	--	0.02 <sup>(2)</sup>
Ammonia	mg/L	3.2	--	9.0		
Total Coliform	MPN/ 100 mL	23 <sup>(3)</sup>		240	--	--

(1)-Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.

(2)-Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.

(3)-Expressed as a 30-day median.

## 6. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct whole effluent toxicity testing for acute and chronic toxicity, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (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 III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, "...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate...". USEPA 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.*" Accordingly, 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 bioassays -----	70%
Median for any three or more consecutive bioassays -----	90%

- b. **Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** Based on annual whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from 2003 through 2006, 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.

Numeric chronic WET effluent limitations have not been included in this order. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region<sup>1</sup> that contained numeric chronic

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Matter of the Review of Own Motion of Waste Discharge Requirements Order Nos. R4-2002-0121 [NPDES No. CA0054011] and R4-2002-0123 [NPDES NO. CA0055119] and Time Schedule Order Nos. R4-

toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petition, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, *“In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits.”* The process to revise the SIP is currently underway. Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limits in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the toxicity control provisions in the SIP are under revision it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. Therefore, this Order requires that the Discharger meet best management practices for compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, as allowed under 40 CFR 122.44(k).

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, the Discharger is required to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section V.). Furthermore, Special Provisions VI.C.2.a. of this Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates a pattern of toxicity exceeding the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), in accordance with an approved TRE work plan. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation, it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if a pattern of effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

## **D. Final Effluent Limitations**

### **1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations.**

Title 40 CFR 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 CFR 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 CFR

---

2002-0122 and R4-2002-0124 for Los Coyotes and Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plants Issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1496 AND 1496(a)

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 MCLs) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the permitted average daily discharge flow allowed in Section IV.A.1.g. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

## **2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations.**

Title 40 CFR 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) unless impracticable. However, for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting, the US EPA recommends the use of a maximum daily effluent limitation in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for two reasons. *“First, the basis for the 7-day average for POTWs derives from the secondary treatment requirements. This basis is not related to the need for assuring achievement of water quality standards. Second, a 7-day average, which could comprise up to seven or more daily samples, could average out peak toxic concentrations and therefore the discharge’s potential for causing acute toxic effects would be missed.”* (TSD, pg. 96) This Order utilizes maximum daily effluent limitations in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for chlorine residual<sup>2</sup>, ammonia, zinc, dichlorobromomethane, chlorodibromomethane, and beta-BHC as recommended by the TSD for the achievement of water quality standards and for the protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. Furthermore, for BOD, TSS, pH, and coliform, weekly average effluent limitations 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 Attachment F, Section IV.C.3., above.

## **3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.**

All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order.

## **4. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy**

The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

---

<sup>2</sup> This Order applies the USEPA National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for chlorine directly as effluent limitations (1 hour average, acute, and 4-day average, chronic). See Section IV.C.3., above, for rationale regarding the chlorine residual effluent limitations.

**5. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations - Discharge Point D-001**

**Table F-17. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instant. Minimum	Instant. Maximum	
Average Dry Weather Flow	mgd	2.0	--	--	--	--	Design
BOD <sup>(1)</sup>	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	Tech.
	lbs/day <sup>2</sup>	167	250	500	--	--	Tech.
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	30	--	--	Tech.
	lbs/day <sup>2</sup>	167	250	500	--	--	Tech.
Removal	85% removal BOD <sub>5</sub> and TSS						Tech.
pH	--	--	--	--	6.0	9.0	Tech.
Zinc, Total Recoverable	ug/L	139	--	279	--	--	BP
Chlorodibromomethane	ug/L	29	--	58.2	--	--	CTR
Dichlorobromomethane	ug/L	43.5	--	87.2	--	--	CTR
beta-BHC	ug/L	0.06	--	0.12	--	--	BP
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	0.01 <sup>3</sup>	0.02 <sup>4</sup>	--	--	USEPA
Ammonia	mg/L	3.2		9.0			BP/USEPA
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	23 <sup>5</sup>	--	240	--	--	BP/DHS

<sup>1</sup> 5-day, 20°C Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)

<sup>2</sup> Based upon a design dry weather treatment capacity of 2.0 mgd, applicable from May through September

<sup>3</sup> 4-day average

<sup>4</sup> 1-hour average

<sup>5</sup> 30-day median

## **E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable**

## **F. Land Discharge Specifications**

The Land Discharge Specifications are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the groundwater.

## **G. Reclamation Specifications**

Treated wastewater discharged for reclamation is regulated under separate water reclamation requirements and must meet the requirements of California Code of Regulations, Title 22.

## **V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

Basin Plan water quality objectives to protect the beneficial uses of surface water and groundwater include numeric objectives and narrative objectives, including objectives for chemical constituents, toxicity, and tastes and odors. The toxicity objective requires that surface water and 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 requires that surface water and groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect any beneficial use or that exceed the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) in Title 22, CCR. The tastes and odors objective states that surface water and groundwater shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that surface water and groundwater do not contain chemical constituents, toxic substances, radionuclides, or taste and odor producing substances in concentrations that adversely affect domestic drinking water supply, agricultural supply, or any other beneficial use.

### **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 Regional 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 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, chemical constituents, color, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, salinity, sediment, settleable material, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity.

Numeric Basin Plan objectives for bacteria, dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, and turbidity are applicable to this discharge and have been incorporated as Receiving Surface Water Limitations. Rational for these numeric receiving surface water limitations are as follows:

- a. **Bacteria.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[I]n water designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml.” Numeric Receiving Water Limitations for bacteria are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- b. **Biostimulatory Substances.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[W]ater shall not contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.” Receiving Water Limitations for biostimulatory substances are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- c. **Color.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[W]ater shall be free of discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.” Receiving Water Limitations for color are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- d. **Chemical Constituents.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[W]aters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.” Receiving Water Limitations for chemical constituents are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- e. **Dissolved Oxygen.** The Sacramento River has been designated as having the beneficial use of cold freshwater aquatic habitat (COLD). For water bodies designated as having COLD as a beneficial use, the Basin Plan includes a water quality objective of maintaining a minimum of 7.0 mg/L of dissolved oxygen. Since the beneficial use of COLD does apply to the Sacramento River, a receiving water limitation of 7.0 mg/L for dissolved oxygen was included in this Order.

In addition, the Basin Plan includes a site-specific dissolved oxygen water quality objective of 9.0 mg/L for this reach of the Sacramento River from 1 June to 31 August. For this reason a receiving water limitation of 9.0 mg/L for dissolved oxygen from 1 June to 31 August is included in the Order.

For surface water bodies outside of the Delta, the Basin Plan includes the water quality objective that “...the monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration shall not fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass, and the 95 percentile concentration shall not fall below 75 percent of

*saturation.*” This objective was included as a receiving water limitation in this Order.

- f. **Floating Material.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[W]ater shall not contain floating material in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.” Receiving Water Limitations for floating material are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- g. **Oil and Grease.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[W]aters shall not contain oils, greases, waxes, or other materials 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.” Receiving Water Limitations for oil and grease are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- h. **pH.** The Basin Plan includes water quality objective that “[T]he pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5. Changes in normal ambient pH levels shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh waters with designated COLD or WARM beneficial uses” This Order includes receiving water limitations for both pH range and pH change.

The Basin Plan allows an appropriate averaging period for pH change in the receiving stream. Since there is no technical information available that indicates that aquatic organisms are adversely affected by shifts in pH within the 6.5 to 8.5 range, an averaging period is considered appropriate and a monthly averaging period for determining compliance with the 0.5 receiving water pH limitation is included in this Order.

- i. **Pesticides.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for pesticides beginning on page III-6.00. Receiving Water Limitations for pesticides are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- j. **Radioactivity.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[R]adionuclides shall not 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.” The Basin Plan states further that “[A]t a minimum, waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of radionuclides in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations...” Receiving Water Limitations for radioactivity are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- k. **Sediment.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that “[T]he suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters shall not be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely

*affect beneficial uses”* Receiving Water Limitations for suspended sediments are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.

- I. Settleable Material.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *“[W]aters shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.”* Receiving Water Limitations for settleable material are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- m. Suspended Material.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *“[W]aters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.”* Receiving Water Limitations for suspended material are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- n. Taste and Odors.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *“[W]ater 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.”* Receiving Water Limitations for taste- or odor-producing substances are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- o. Temperature.** The Sacramento River has the beneficial uses of both COLD and WARM. The Basin Plan includes the objective that *“[a]t no time or place shall the temperature of COLD or WARM intrastate waters be increased more than 5°F above natural receiving water temperature.”* In addition, the Basin Plan includes a site-specific objective for this reach of the Sacramento River that limits an increase in natural temperature to higher than 56°F when such an increase will be detrimental to the fishery. This Order includes a receiving water limitation based on these objectives.
- p. Toxicity.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *“[A]ll waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.”* Receiving Water Limitations for toxicity are included in this Order and are based on the Basin Plan objective.
- q. Turbidity.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective that *“[I]ncreases in turbidity attributable to controllable water quality factors shall not exceed the following limits:*

  - Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs), increases shall not exceed 1 NTU.*
  - Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 20 percent.*

- *Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 NTUs.*
- *Where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 percent.”*

A numeric Receiving Surface Water Limitation for turbidity is included in this Order and is based on the Basin Plan objective for turbidity.

## **B. Groundwater**

1. The beneficial uses of the underlying ground water are municipal and domestic supply, 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 as municipal supply. These include, at a minimum, compliance with MCLs 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 MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

Section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorizes the Regional Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order, establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to 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., BOD and TSS reduction requirements).

## B. Effluent Monitoring

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR §122.44(i)(2) effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations. Effluent monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with effluent limitations, assess the effectiveness of the treatment process, and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream and groundwater.
2. The SIP states that if “...all reported detection limits of the pollutant in the effluent are greater than or equal to the C [water quality criterion or objective] value, the RWQCB [Regional Water Board] shall establish interim requirements...that require additional monitoring for the pollutant...” All reported detection limits for acrylonitrile, 1,1-dichloroethylene, pentachlorophenol, benzidine, benzo (a) anthracene, benzo (a) pyrene, benzo (b) fluoranthene, benzo (k) fluoranthene, bis (2-chloroethyl) ether, chrysene, dibenzo (a, h) anthracene, 3,3 dichlorobenzidine, 2,4-dinitrotoluene, 1,2-diphenylhydrazine, hexachlorobenzene, indeno (1,2,3-cd) pyrene, n-nitrosodimethylamine, n-nitrosodi-n-propylamine, aldrin, chlordane, 4,4'-DDT, 4,4'-DDE, 4,4'-DDD, dieldrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, PCB 1016, PCB 1221, PCB 1232, PCB 1242, PCB 1248, PCB 1254, PCB 1260, and toxaphene are greater than or equal to corresponding applicable water quality criteria or objectives. Monitoring for these constituents has been included in this Order in accordance with the SIP.
3. Effluent monitoring for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, aluminum, nitrate, and nitrite are necessary to assess whether there is a reasonable potential for an exceedence of a water quality criteria/objective in the receiving water.

## C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Quarterly 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Annual chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate 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 for total and dissolved concentrations of cadmium, copper, and zinc are necessary to assess the site-specific metal translators and to comply with the TMDL water management study.

## **2. Groundwater – Not Applicable**

### **E. Other Monitoring Requirements**

#### **1. Biosolids Monitoring**

Biosolids monitoring is required to ensure compliance with the biosolids disposal requirements (Special Provisions VI.C.6.a.). Biosolids disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation.

#### **2. Water Supply Monitoring**

Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater.

## **VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS**

### **A. Standard Provisions**

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 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 section 122.42.

Section 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) 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) allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 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. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE). This Order may be reopened to

- include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation based on that objective.
- b. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating CTR criteria for applicable priority pollutant inorganic constituents. In addition, site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for copper and zinc. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or additional site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
  - c. **Technical Studies.** The Discharger may perform technical studies in order to demonstrate and justify a change or modification of effluent limitations. This Order may be reopened for the addition and/or modification of effluent limitations and requirements.
  - d. **Effluent Quality and Treatment Performance Study.** The treatment processes employed at the treatment plant were designed and intended to provide specific pollutant removal efficiency. This Order contains effluent limitations that are partially based on the treatment plant's ability to remove pollutants. This Order also considers the availability of dilution in the receiving water to minimize the impact of pollutants discharged from the treatment plant. In order to comply with the intent of the State and Federal anti-degradation policies, use of dilution shall not be allowed as a means to allow a reduction in pollutant removal at the treatment plant. The use of dilution and a mixing zone shall be the minimum necessary and justifiable to ensure that the treatment plant's pollutant removal efficiency is adequate to ensure protection of receiving water beneficial uses and attainment of receiving water criteria and objectives. Therefore, if a trend of declining treatment plant pollutant removal efficiency, or a trend of increasing effluent pollutant concentrations is observed, the Discharger is required to submit an Effluent Quality and Treatment Performance Study that identifies the cause of the change in effluent quality. If the Regional Board determines that the change and resulting degradation is not warranted or not in compliance with the anti-degradation policy, then this Order may be reopened, and the effluent limitations tightened, or other regulatory measures may be employed to ensure that the quality of the receiving water is not unnecessarily degraded.

## 2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity 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 III-8.00.) Adequate WET

data is not available to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Attachment E of this Order requires annual chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective.

In addition to WET monitoring, this provision requires the Discharger to submit to the Regional Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger and requirements for accelerated monitoring, as well as, requirements for TRE initiation if a pattern of toxicity is demonstrated.

**Monitoring Trigger.** A numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of  $>9$  TUc (where TUc =  $100/\text{NOEC}$ ) is applied in the provision, because this Order does allow dilution for the chronic condition. Minimum dilution credit to be applied is 9 parts of receiving water to 1 part effluent resulting in a theoretical allowance TUc of 9. The discharge showed no chronic toxicity at 100% effluent during the past permitted cycle. Therefore, based on best professional judgment, a cap of 9 to 1 dilution has been applied, and a monitoring trigger of greater than 9 TUc has been applied.

**Accelerated Monitoring.** The provision requires accelerated WET testing when a regular WET test result exceeds the monitoring trigger. The purpose of accelerated monitoring is to determine, in an expedient manner, whether there is a pattern of toxicity before requiring the implementation of a TRE. Due to possible seasonality of the toxicity, the accelerated monitoring should be performed in a timely manner, preferably taking no more than 2 to 3 months to complete.


The provision requires accelerated monitoring consisting of four chronic toxicity tests every two weeks using the species that exhibited toxicity. Guidance regarding accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation is provided in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991* (TSD). The TSD at page 118 states, "EPA recommends if toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present at levels above effluent limits more than 20 percent of the time, a TRE should be required." Therefore, four accelerated monitoring tests are required in this provision. If no toxicity is demonstrated in the four accelerated tests, then it demonstrates that toxicity is not present at levels above the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time (only 1 of 5 tests are toxic, including the initial test). However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity (i.e. toxicity present exceeding the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time), the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

See the WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart (Figure F-1), below, for further clarification of the accelerated monitoring requirements and for the decision points for determining the need for TRE initiation.

**TRE Guidance.** The Discharger is required to prepare a TRE Work Plan in accordance with USEPA guidance. Numerous guidance documents are available, as identified below:

- *Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants*, (EPA/833B-99/002), August 1999.
- *Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial TREs*, (EPA/600/2-88/070), April 1989.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures*, Second Edition, EPA 600/6-91/005F, February 1991.
- *Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I*, EPA 600/6-91/005F, May 1992.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase II Toxicity Identification Procedures for Samples Exhibiting acute and Chronic Toxicity*, Second Edition, EPA 600/R-92/080, September 1993.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase III Toxicity Confirmation Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity*, Second Edition, EPA 600/R-92/081, September 1993.
- *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms*, Fifth Edition, EPA-821-R-02-012, October 2002.
- *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.
- *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991

**Figure F-1**  
**WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart**



**b. Groundwater Monitoring (Special Provisions VI.C.2.d.) - Not Applicable**

**c. Dilution Credit Update.** The Dilution Credit Update is necessary to account for changes in dilution ratios for acute, chronic, and human health criteria/objectives. The dilution ratio is dependant on various critical receiving water flow values and effluent flow values. Such flow values need to be continually updated to account for new data and potential plant upgrades.

**d. Site-Specific Translator Study.** The translator study is required in order to continue to refine the current site-specific metal translators as the remediation efforts to decrease cadmium, copper, and zinc loadings to the Sacramento River continue upstream at Iron Mountain Mine.

**3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

**a. Pollutant Minimization Plan.** In an effort to reduce all potential sources of a priority pollutant(s) and to maintain effluent concentration at or below the water quality-based effluent limitation, this Order requires the Discharger to develop and conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) when there is evidence that a priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either: 1) A sample result is reported as DNQ and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or 2) A sample result is reported as ND and the effluent limitation is less than the MDL.

**b. Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** In an effort to minimize salt loading to the Sacramento River, this Order requires the Discharger to submit a salinity evaluation and minimization plan to address sources of salinity from the Facility.

**4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications – Not Applicable**

**5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)**

**a. Pretreatment Requirements.**

i. The Federal Clean Water Act, Section 307(b), and Federal Regulations, 40 CFR Part 403, require publicly owned treatment works to develop an acceptable industrial pretreatment program. A pretreatment program is required to prevent the introduction of pollutants, which will interfere with treatment plant operations or sludge disposal, and prevent pass through of pollutants that exceed water quality objectives, standards or permit limitations. Pretreatment requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 403.

**b. Sanitary Sewer Overflow Requirements.**

On May 2, 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order 2006-0003, a Statewide General WDR for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order 2006-0003 and any future revisions thereto. Order 2006-0003 requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the General WDR.

**6. Other Special Provisions**

- a. This Order requires the Discharger to use the best practicable treatment or control technique currently available to limit mineralization to no more than a reasonable increment.
- b. Recycled water shall meet the criteria contained in Chapter 3, Division 4, Title 22, California Code of Regulations (CCR) (Section 60301, et. seq.).
- c. 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 Title 16, CCR, 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.
- d. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition or limitation contained in this Order, this Order requires the Discharger to notify the Regional Water Board by telephone (530) 224-4845 (or to the Regional Water Board staff engineer assigned to the facility) within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless the Regional Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by Federal Standard Provision [40 CFR §122.41(l)(6)(i)].
- e. Prior to making any change in the discharge point, place of use, or purpose of use of the wastewater, the Discharger must obtain approval of, or clearance from the State Water Resources Control Board (Division of Water Rights).

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 this office.

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 Regional Water Board and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory paragraph of Federal Standard Provision V.B.5 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 California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

## **7. Compliance Schedules- Not Applicable**

## **VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (Regional Water Board) is considering the issuance of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the Stillwater Wastewater Treatment Facility. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Regional Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs. The Regional Water Board encourages public participation in the WDR adoption process.

### **A. Notification of Interested Parties**

The Regional Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through physical (including local newspaper announcement) and Internet posting.

### **B. Written Comments**

The staff determinations are tentative. Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning these tentative WDRs. Comments must be submitted either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Regional Water Board at the address above on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, written comments should be received at the Regional Water Board offices **by noon on 25 October 2007.**

### **C. Public Hearing**

The Regional Water Board will hold a public hearing on the tentative WDRs during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: 6/7 December 2007  
Time: 8:30 am  
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region  
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

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

Please be aware that dates and venues may change. Our Web address is <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb5/> where you can access the current agenda for changes in dates and locations.

### **D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions**

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

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

### **E. Information and Copying**

The Report of Waste Discharge (RWD), related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special provisions, comments received, and other information 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 Regional Water Board by calling (530) 224-4845.

### **F. Register of Interested Persons**

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional Water Board, reference 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 Stacy Gotham at (530) 224-4845.