State of California
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, LOS ANGELES REGION

ORDER NO. R4-2007-0016
AMENDING ORDER NO. R4-2003-0099
NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0061638

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM PERMIT
AND
WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA
(Drainage Benefit Assessment Areas No. 6 and No. 18, Canyon Country)

The California Regional Water Quality Board, Los Angeles Region (hereinafter Regional Board), finds:

Background

1. City of Santa Clarita (hereinafter Discharger) discharges wastewater under waste discharge requirements (WDRs) contained in Order No. 96-079 adopted by the Regional Board on November 4, 1996. Order 96-079 serves as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (CA0061638). The Order was originally issued during the development of the Outlook Project Homes in Canyon Country, City of Santa Clarita.

2. The Discharger has filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and has applied for renewal of its WDRs and NPDES permit.

Purpose of Order

3. The purpose of this order is to renew the WDRs for the Outlook Project Homes. This NPDES permit regulates the discharge of effluent from the groundwater dewatering systems with a maximum flow rate of 67,000 gallons per day (GPD). The effluent from Areas No. 6 and No. 18 are discharged to the Santa Clara River.

    - Discharge Serial No. 001 (Pump Station No. 1) is located at 18657 Nathan Hill Road (near the intersection of Vicci Street) and discharges a maximum of 3,000 gpd of dewatered groundwater to Private Drain 580 located at Latitude 34°, 25', 20" North and Longitude 118°, 27', 50" West (see Figure 1). Drain 580 empties into a concrete lined flood control channel at the cul-de-sac of Shangri-LA Drive.

    - Discharge Serial No. 002 (Pump Station No. 2) is located at 27807 Bakerton Avenue (on an access road adjacent to the same concrete lined flood control channel) (see Figure 1) and discharges a maximum of 67,000 gpd of dewatered groundwater directly to the channel.

The concrete lined flood control channel drains to the Santa Clara River, a water of the United States, at its intersection with Canyon View Drive, approximately 3,300 feet downstream from Soledad Canyon Road bridge, above the estuary. The Santa Clara River in this area is normally dry except during periods of extended rainfalls.

Facility Description

4. The dewatering system was installed by American Landmark Development, Inc., at the base of shear keys for soil stabilization and drainage improvement in the area surrounding the Outlook Project Homes in the City of Santa Clarita. The system consists of two pump stations and several observation wells within the Drainage Benefit Assessment Areas Nos. 6 and 18. On February 22, 1991, the dewatering system was transferred to the City of Santa Clarita for operation and maintenance.

Discharge Description

5. The effluent characteristics as reported in the ROWD for the wastes discharged from the Drainage Benefit Assessment Areas Nos. 6 and 18 from October 1996 through January 2002 are as follows:

Constituent	Unit	Effluent Limits		Pump Station No. 1	Pump Station No. 2
		Average	Maximum		
Total waste flow	gal/day			1,334	50,101
Total dissolved solids	mg/L	---	1,500	1,300	1,200
Chloride	mg/L	---	250	280	240
Temperature	°F	---	---	74	75
pH	pH Units	---	---	7.6	7.7
Sulfates	mg/L	---	150	190	190
Nitrate + Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	---	5.0	9.3	11.5
Boron	mg/L	---	1.0	0.81	1.4
Suspended Solids	mg/L	50	150	40	<10
Oil and grease	mg/L	10	15	<3	<3
Sulfides	mg/L	---	1.0	<0.1	<0.1
Settleable solids	ml/L	0.1	0.3	<0.1	<0.1
$BOD_5 20^oC$	mg/L	20	60	2.8	<2

6. Order No. 96-079 included limits for several of the conventional and non-conventional pollutants including, oil and grease, $BOD_5 20^oC$, settleable solids, suspended solids, total dissolved solids (TDS), sulfate, chloride, nitrate and nitrite as nitrogen, boron, and sulfides. The data collected reveals a chronic problem with exceedances of chloride and sulfate from Pump Station No. 1 and with nitrate and nitrite as nitrogen and sulfate from Pump Station No. 2. The permit also required annual monitoring of the priority pollutants.

Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations

7. On June 13, 1994, the Regional Board adopted a revised Basin Plan as amended on January 27, 1997 by Regional Board Resolution No. 97-02. The Basin Plan (i) designates beneficial uses for surface and groundwaters, (ii) sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated beneficial uses and conform to the state antidegradation policy (*Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California*, State Board Resolution No. 68-16, October 28, 1968), and (iii) describes implementation programs to protect all waters in the Region. In addition, the Basin Plan incorporates (by reference) applicable State and Regional Board plans and policies and other pertinent water quality policies and regulations. The Regional Board prepared the 1994 update of the Basin Plan to be consistent with all previously adopted State and Regional Board plans and policies. This Order implements the plans, policies and provisions of the Regional Board's Basin Plan.

8. The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives and beneficial uses for inland surface waters and for the Pacific Ocean. Inland surface waters consist of rivers, streams, lakes, reservoirs, and inland wetlands.

9. The receiving water for the permitted discharge covered by this permit is the Santa Clara River. The Santa Clara River is the largest river system in Southern California that remains in a relatively natural state. It is a high quality natural resource for much of its length. The river originates in the northern slope of the San Gabriel Mountains in Los Angeles County, traverses Ventura County, and flows into the Pacific Ocean halfway between the cities of San Buenaventura and Oxnard.

10. The discharged effluent enters the Santa Clara River east of Bouquet Canyon Creek and travels toward the Pacific Ocean. The Basin Plan contains water quality objectives for and lists the following beneficial uses for the following hydrologic units of the Santa Clara River.

    Santa Clara River – Hydrologic Unit 403.51

    Existing: industrial service supply, industrial process supply, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, warm freshwater habitat, contact and noncontact water recreation, freshwater replenishment, wildlife habitat, wetland habitat, and rare, threatened, or endangered species.

    Potential: municipal and domestic supply.

    Santa Clara River – Hydrologic Unit 403.41

    Existing: industrial service supply, industrial process supply, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, freshwater replenishment, warm freshwater habitat, contact and noncontact water recreation, wildlife habitat, migration of aquatic organisms, wetland habitat, and rare, threatened, or endangered species.

    Potential: municipal and domestic supply.

Santa Clara River – Hydrologic Unit 403.31

Existing: industrial service supply, industrial process supply, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, warm freshwater habitat, contact and noncontact water recreation, freshwater replenishment, wildlife habitat, migration of aquatic organisms, wetland habitat, and rare, threatened, or endangered species.

Potential: municipal and domestic supply.

Santa Clara River – Hydrologic Unit 403.21

Existing: industrial service supply, industrial process supply, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, warm freshwater habitat, contact and noncontact water recreation, freshwater replenishment, wildlife habitat, migration of aquatic organisms, wetland habitat, and rare, threatened, or endangered species.

Potential: municipal and domestic supply.

Santa Clara River – Hydrologic Unit 403.11

Existing: industrial service supply, industrial process supply, agricultural supply, groundwater recharge, warm freshwater habitat, contact and noncontact water recreation, freshwater replenishment, cold freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, migration of aquatic organisms, wetland habitat, and rare, threatened, or endangered species.

Potential: municipal and domestic supply.

Santa Clara River Estuary – Hydrologic Unit 403.11

Existing: noncontact and contact water recreation, navigation, commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, marine habitat, wildlife habitat, wetland habitat, migration of aquatic organisms, spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, and rare, threatened, or endangered species.

Potential: shellfish harvesting.

Ventura County Coastal - Nearshore Zone (Bounded by the shoreline and a line 1,000 feet from the shoreline or the 30-foot depth contour, whichever is farther from shore):

Existing: industrial service supply, navigation, water contact and non-contact water recreation, commercial and sport fishing, support of marine habitat, support of wildlife habitat, preservation of biological habitats, support of rare, threatened, or endangered species, migration of aquatic organisms, support of habitats suitable for spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, and support of habitats suitable for shellfish harvesting.

Ventura County Coastal - Offshore Zone:

Existing: navigation, water contact and non-contact water recreation, commercial and sport fishing, support of marine habitat, support of wildlife habitat, support of rare, threatened, or endangered species, migration of aquatic organisms, support of habitats suitable for spawning, and support of habitats suitable for shellfish harvesting.

The potential municipal and domestic supply beneficial (MUN) use for the Santa Clara River is consistent with Regional Board Resolution 89-03; however the Regional Board has only conditionally designated the MUN beneficial uses and at this time cannot establish effluent limitations designed to protect the conditional designation.

11. Ammonia Basin Plan Amendment. The 1994 Basin Plan provided water quality objectives for ammonia to protect aquatic life, in Tables 3-1 through Tables 3-4. However, those ammonia objectives were revised on April 25, 2002, by the Regional Board with the adoption of Resolution No. 2002-011, *Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Update the Ammonia Objectives for Inland Surface Waters (including enclosed bays, estuaries and wetlands) with Beneficial Use designations for protection of Aquatic Life*. The ammonia Basin Plan amendment was approved by the State Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA on April 30, 2003, June 5, 2003, and June 19, 2003, respectively. Although the revised ammonia water quality objectives may be less stringent than those contained in the 1994 Basin Plan, they are still protective of aquatic life and are consistent with USEPA's 1999 ammonia criteria update.

12. The State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan for Control of Temperature in the Coastal and Interstate Water and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* (Thermal Plan) on May 18, 1972, and amended this plan on September 18, 1975. This plan contains temperature objectives for inland surface waters.

13. On May 18, 2000, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) promulgated numeric criteria for priority pollutants for the State of California [known as the *California Toxics Rule* (CTR) and codified as 40 CFR 131.38]. In the CTR, USEPA promulgated criteria that protect the general population at an incremental cancer risk level of one in a million (10^{-6}), for all priority toxic pollutants regulated as carcinogens. The CTR also provides a schedule of compliance not to exceed 5 years from the date of permit issuance for a point source discharge if the Discharger demonstrates that it is infeasible to promptly comply with the CTR criteria.

14. On March 2, 2000, the State 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 was effective on April 28, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the USEPA through the National Toxics Rule (NTR), and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Regional Boards in their basin plans, with the exception of the provision on alternate test procedures for individual discharges that have been approved by the USEPA Regional Administrator. The alternate test procedures provision was effective on May 22, 2000. The SIP was effective on May 18, 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the

USEPA through the CTR. The SIP requires the dischargers' submittal of data sufficient to conduct the determination of priority pollutants requiring water quality-based effluent limits (WQBELs) and to calculate the effluent limitations. The CTR criteria for freshwater or human health for consumption of organisms, whichever is more stringent, are used to develop the effluent limitations in this Order to protect the beneficial uses of the Santa Clara River.

15. Under 40 CFR 122.44(d), Water Quality Standards and State Requirements, "Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, non-conventional, or toxic pollutants), which the Director [permitting authority] determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality." Where numeric effluent limitations for a pollutant or pollutant parameter have not been established in the applicable state water quality control plan, 40 CFR section 122.44(d)(1)(vi) specifies that WQBELs may be set based on USEPA criteria, and may be supplemented where necessary by other relevant information to attain and maintain narrative water quality criteria, and to fully protect designated beneficial uses.

16. Effluent limitation guidelines requiring the application of best practicable control technology currently available (BPT), best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT), and best available technology economically achievable (BAT), were promulgated by the USEPA for some pollutants in this discharge. Effluent limitations for pollutants not subject to the USEPA effluent limitation guidelines are based on one of the following: best professional judgment (BPJ) of BPT, BCT or BAT; current plant performance; or WQBELs. The WQBELs are based on the Basin Plan, other State plans and policies, or USEPA water quality criteria which are taken from the CTR. These requirements, as they are met, will protect and maintain existing beneficial uses of the receiving water.

17. 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(1) requires that except under certain conditions, all permit limits, standards, or prohibitions be expressed in terms of mass units. 40 CFR section 122.45(f)(2) allows the permit writer, at his its discretion, to express limits in additional units (e.g., concentration units). The regulations mandate that, where limits are expressed in more than one unit, the permittee must comply with both.

    Generally, mass-based limits ensure that proper treatment, and not dilution is employed to comply with the final effluent concentration limits. Concentration-based effluent limits, on the other hand, discourage the reduction in treatment efficiency during low-flow periods and require proper operation of the treatment units at all times. In the absence of concentration-based effluent limits, a permittee would be able to increase its effluent concentration (i.e., reduce its level of treatment) during low-flow periods and still meet its mass-based limits. To account for this, this permit includes mass and concentration limits for some constituents.

18. State and Federal antibacksliding and antidegradation policies require Regional Board actions to protect the water quality of a water body and to ensure that the waterbody will not be further degraded. The antibacksliding provisions are specified in section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and in Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR), section 122.44(l). Those provisions require a reissued permit to be as stringent as the previous permit with some exceptions where effluent limitations may be relaxed.

19. Effluent limitations are established in accordance with sections 301, 304, 306, and 307 of the CWA, and amendments thereto. The fact sheet accompanying this Order includes specific bases for the effluent limitations, and further documents the bases for effluent limitations and requirements contained in this order. These requirements, as they are met, will maintain and protect the beneficial uses of the Santa Clara River.

Watershed Management Approach and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

20. The Regional Board has implemented the Watershed Management Approach to address water quality issues in the region. Watershed management may include diverse issues as defined by stakeholders to identify comprehensive solutions to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore water quality and beneficial uses. To achieve this goal, the Watershed Management Approach integrates the Regional Board's many diverse programs, particularly Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), to better assess cumulative impacts of pollutants from all point and non-point sources. A TMDL is a tool for implementing water quality standards and is based on the relationship between pollution sources and in-stream water quality conditions. The TMDL establishes the allowable loadings or other quantifiable parameters for a waterbody and thereby provides the basis to establish water quality-based controls. These controls should provide the pollution reduction necessary for a waterbody to meet water quality standards. This process facilitates the development of watershed-specific solutions that balance the environmental and economic impacts within the watershed. The TMDLs will establish waste load allocation (WLAs) and load allocations (LAs) for point and non-point sources, and will result in achieving water quality standards for the waterbody.

20. Limited data (beyond mineral quality and nitrogen) is available for much of the Santa Clara River. Reach 9 of the Santa Clara River, which is in the vicinity of the discharge, appears on the 2002 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for high coliform content. Downstream reaches of the River have been listed for chloride, nitrate and nitrite, high coliform count, total dissolved solids and ammonia. The Santa Clara River Estuary is listed for high coliform count, toxaphene and Chem A (which includes the sum of aldrin, dieldrin, chlordane, endrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide, HCH (including lindane) and endosulfan.

21. The TMDLs will assess the extent and sources of the ammonia and algae (nutrient/nitrogen) problems in the Santa Clara River. According to the TMDL schedule under the amended concent decree, *Heal the Bay, Santa Monica Bay Keeper, et al. v. Browner, et al.* (March 23, 1999), the nitrogen and chloride TMDLs for the Santa Clara River Watershed must be completed by March 2003 and March 2002 respectively. The remaining TMDLs, such as eutrophication, trash, and coliform are scheduled for completion in 2005 and 2006.

    Chloride TMDL. On October 24, 2002, the Regional Board adopted Resolution No. 2002-018, Amendment to the Basin Plan for the Los Angeles Region to Incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load to Reduce Chloride Loading in the Upper Santa Clara River which includes Reaches 5 and 6. This discharge is upstream of the two reaches that are included in the adopted chloride TMDL.

Data Availability and Reasonable Potential Monitoring

22. 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i) and (ii) require that each toxic pollutant be analyzed with respect to its reasonable potential to (1) cause; (2) have the reasonable potential to cause; or (3)

contribute to the exceedance of a receiving water quality objective. This is done by performing a reasonable potential analysis (RPA) for each pollutant.

23. Section 1.3 of the SIP requires that a limit be imposed for a toxic pollutant if (1) the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) is greater than the most stringent CTR criteria, or (2) the background concentration is greater than the CTR criteria, or (3) other information is available.

24. The Regional Board has determined that reasonable potential exists for seven of the priority pollutants evaluated; therefore effluent limitations have been established for these pollutants. All of these are new constituents and the effluent limits were derived using water quality criteria contained in the CTR and the requirements contained in Section 1.4 of the SIP.

Compliance Schedules and Interim Limitations

25. City of Santa Clarita may not be able to achieve immediate compliance with the WQBELs for indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, copper, lead, and mercury in Section I.B.4. of this Order. Data submitted in self-monitoring reports indicate that these constituents have been detected at a concentration greater than the new limit proposed in this Order. A compliance schedule including requirements for these constituents has been developed.

26. 40 CFR 131.38(e) and the CTR provide conditions under which interim effluent limits and compliance schedules may be issued. The CTR and SIP allow inclusion of an interim limit with a specific compliance schedule of up to five years in a NPDES permit for priority pollutants if the limit for the priority pollutant is CTR-based. Interim limits for indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, copper, lead, and mercury are contained in this Order.

27. The SIP requires that the Regional Board establish other interim requirements, such as requiring the discharger to develop a pollutant minimization plan and/or source control measures. Once final limitations become effective, the interim limitations will no longer apply.

28. The current permit (Order No. 96-079) included adjusted limits for chloride and total dissolved solids (TDS) based on a feasibility analysis submitted by the Discharger. Data submitted in the self-monitoring reports indicates that the Discharger will not immediately be able to meet the limits as prescribed in the Basin Plan. Thus, the Discharger has requested interim limits for these constituents. A Time Schedule Order (TSO) has been developed which will include interim requirements for chloride and TDS.

29. The current permit also includes effluent limits for nitrate + nitrite as nitrogen of 5 mg/L and sulfate of 150 mg/L. Nitrate + nitrite as nitrogen concentrations detected at Discharge Serial No. 002 have exceeded the effluent limitation of 5 mg/L during each of the sampling events. The data also shows an increasing trend for the sulfate concentrations such that since 2000 discharges from Discharge Serial No. 001 and 002 exceed the limit.

30. The Discharger has requested interim limits for nitrate + nitrite as nitrogen (12 mg/L) at Discharge Serial No. 002 and for sulfate (190 mg/L) at Discharge Serial Nos. 001 and 002. These interim limits along with the specific requirements of the work plan submitted by the

City of Santa Clarita via email on May 30, 2003 will be implemented in a TSO issued concurrently with this Order.

CEQA and Notifications

31. The Regional Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to issue waste discharge requirements for this discharge, and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.

32. The Regional Board, in a public hearing, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge and to the tentative requirements.

33. This Order shall serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit pursuant to Section 402 of the Federal Clean Water Act or amendments thereto, and shall take effect in accordance with federal law, provided the Regional Administrator, USEPA, has no objections.

34. Pursuant to California Water Code section 13320, any aggrieved party may seek review of this Order by filing a petition with the State Board. A petition must be sent to the State Water Resources Control Board, Office of Chief Counsel, ATTN: Elizabeth Miller Jennings, Senior Staff Counsel, 1001 I Street, 22nd Floor, Sacramento, California, 95814, within 30 days of adoption of this Order.

35. The issuance of waste discharge requirements for this discharge is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code (CEQA) in accordance with the California Water Code, section 13389.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that City of Santa Clarita, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted there under, and the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act and regulations and guidelines adopted there under, shall comply with the following:

I. DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

A. Discharge Prohibition

1. Wastes discharged shall be limited a maximum of 3,000 gpd of groundwater from Discharge Serial 001 and 67,000 gpd of groundwater from Discharge Serial 002, as proposed.

2. Discharges of water, materials, thermal wastes, elevated temperature wastes, toxic wastes, deleterious substances, or wastes other than those authorized by this Order, to a storm drain system, Santa Clara River, waters of the United States, or waters of the State, are prohibited.

B. Effluent Limitations

The discharge of an effluent in excess of the following limitations is prohibited:

1. A pH value less than 6.5 or greater than 8.5.

2. A temperature greater than 100° F.

3. Final effluent limitations: The discharge of an effluent with constituents in excess of the following limitations is prohibited:

Constituents	Discharge Limitations			
	Daily Maximum		Monthly Average	
	Concentration	Mass[1] (lbs/day)	Concentration	Mass[1] (lbs/day)
Oil and Grease (mg/L)	15	8.4	10	5.6
BOD_5 (mg/L)	30	16.8	20	11.2
Total suspended solids (mg/L)	150	83.8	50	27.9
Settleable solids (ml/L)	0.3	---	0.1	---
Total dissolved solids (mg/L)	800	447	----	---
Sulfate (mg/L)	150	84	----	---
Chloride (mg/L)	100	56	----	---
Nitrate + Nitrite (as Nitrogen) (mg/L)	5	2.8	----	---
Boron (mg/L)	1	0.56	----	---
Sulfides (mg/L)	1	0.56	----	---
Copper[2,3] (µg/L)	41.9	0.02	12.2	0.07
Cyanide (µg/L)	8.5	0.004	4.3	0.002
Lead[2,3] (µg/L)	34.4	0.02	12.6	0.007
Mercury[2,3] (µg/L)	0.14	0.00007	0.05	0.00003
Thallium[2] (µg/L)	12.6	0.007	6.3	0.004
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (µg/L)	11.8	0.006	5.9	0.003
Indeno (1,2,3-cd) pyrene[3] (µg/L)	0.09	0.00005	0.05	0.00003

[1] The mass-based effluent limitations are based on a maximum flow of 67,000 gpd for the daily maximum and the monthly average.
The equation used to calculate the mass is:
$m = 8.34 * C * Q$ where:
m = mass limit for a pollutant in lbs/day
C = concentration limit for a pollutant, mg/L
Q = maximum discharge flow rate
[2] The units for these metals are micrograms per liter (µg/L). Discharge limitations are expressed as total recoverable.
[3] For these constituents, the final effluent limitations in this table shall not apply until June 1, 2006.

4. Interim Effluent Limitations. From the effective date of this Order until June 30, 2006 the discharge of an effluent in excess of the following limitations is prohibited:

Constituents	Discharge Limitations			
	Daily Maximum		Monthly Average	
	Concentration (µg/L)	Mass[1,3] (lbs/day)	Concentration (µg/L)	Mass[1,3] (lbs/day)
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.48	0.0003	---	---
Copper[2]	259	0.14	175	0.09
Lead[2]	34	0.02	22.6	0.01
Mercury[2]	0.24	0.0001	0.14	0.00007

[1] The mass-based effluent limitations are based on a flow rate of 63,000 gpd for daily maximum and the monthly average.
[2] Discharge limitations for these metals are expressed as total recoverable.
[3] Since the increase in the flow rate does not become effective until after the final effective date of the interim effluent limitations, the mass calculations for the interim effluent limitations have not been updated to reflect the increase in the flow rate.

C. Receiving Water Limitations

1. The discharge shall not cause the following conditions to exist in the receiving waters:

   a) Floating, suspended or deposited macroscopic particulate matter or foam;

   b) Alteration of temperature, turbidity, or apparent color beyond present natural background levels;

   c) Visible, floating, suspended or deposited oil or other products of petroleum origin;

   d) Bottom deposits or aquatic growths; or,

   e) Toxic or other deleterious substances to be present in concentrations or quantities which cause deleterious effects on aquatic biota, wildlife, or waterfowl or render any of these unfit for human consumption either at levels created in the receiving waters or as a result of biological concentration.

2. Toxicity limitations:

   a) Acute Toxicity Limitation and Requirements

      (1) The acute toxicity of the effluent shall be such that (i) the average survival in the undiluted effluent for any three (3) consecutive 96-hour static or continuous flow bioassay tests shall be at least 90%, and (ii) no single test producing less than 70% survival.

      (2) If either of the above requirements (Section I.C.2.A.1) is not met, the Discharger shall conduct six additional tests over a six-week period. The Discharger shall ensure that they receive results of a failing acute

toxicity test within 24 hours of the completion of the test, and the additional tests shall begin within 3 business days of the receipt of the result. If the additional tests indicate compliance with acute toxicity limitation, the Discharger may resume regular testing. However if the results of any two of the six accelerated tests are less than 90% survival, then the Discharger shall begin a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE). The TIE shall include all reasonable steps to identify the source(s) of toxicity. Once the source(s) of toxicity is identified, the Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to reduce the toxicity to meet the objective.

(3) If the initial test and any of the additional six acute toxicity bioassay tests result in less than 70% survival, including the initial test, the Discharger shall immediately begin a TIE.

(4) The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 6945.

b) Chronic Toxicity Limitation and Requirements

(1) This Order includes a chronic testing toxicity trigger defined as an exceedance of 1.0 TU_c in a critical life stage test for 100% effluent. (The monthly median for chronic toxicity of 100% effluent shall not exceed, 1 TU_c in a critical life stage test.)

(2) If the chronic toxicity of the effluent exceeds 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall immediately implement accelerated chronic toxicity testing according to Monitoring and Reporting Program 6945, Item IV.D.1. If the results of two of the six accelerated tests exceed 1.0 TU_c, the Discharger shall initiate a TIE and implement the Initial investigation TRE Workplan.

(3) The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity monitoring as specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 6945.

(4) The chronic toxicity of the effluent shall be expressed and reported in toxic units, where:

$$TU_c = \frac{100}{NOEC}$$

The No Observable Effect Concentration (NOEC) is expressed as the maximum percent effluent concentration that causes no observable effect on test organisms, as determined by the results of a critical life stage toxicity test.

(5) Preparation of an Initial Investigation TRE Workplan

i. The Discharger shall submit a copy of the Discharger's initial

investigation Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) workplan (1-2 pages) to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board for approval within 90 days of the effective date of this permit. If the Regional Board Executive Officer does not disapprove the workplan within 60 days, the workplan shall become effective. The Discharger shall use EPA manuals EPA/600/2-88/070 (industrial) or EPA/833B-99/002 (municipal) as guidance. This workplan shall describe the steps the Discharger intends to follow if toxicity is detected, and should include, at a minimum:

ii. A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that would be used to identify potential causes and sources of toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency;

iii. 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,

iv. If a TIE is necessary, an indication of the person who would conduct the TIEs (i.e., an in-house expert or an outside contractor) (See MRP Section IV.E.3. for guidance manuals).

6. The discharge shall not cause nuisance, or adversely effect beneficial uses of the receiving water.

7. No discharge shall cause a surface water temperature rise greater than $5^{o}F$ above the natural temperature of the receiving waters at any time or place.

8. The discharge shall not cause the following limitations to be exceeded in the receiving waters at any place within the waterbody of the receiving waters:

   a) The pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5, nor caused to vary from normal ambient pH levels by more than 0.5 units;

   b) Dissolved oxygen shall not be less than 5.0 mg/L anytime, and the median dissolved oxygen concentration for any three consecutive months shall not be less than 80 percent of the dissolved oxygen content at saturation;

   c) Dissolved sulfide shall not be greater than 0.1 mg/L;

   d) The discharge shall not cause a violation of any applicable water quality standards for receiving waters adopted by the Regional Board or State Board. If more stringent applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to Section 303 of the Clean Water Act, or amendments thereto, the Regional Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such standards.

II. REQUIREMENTS

A. Pollution Prevention and Best Management Practices Plans

The Discharger shall develop and implement, within 90 days of the effective date of this Order, the following plans. If necessary, the plans shall be updated to address any changes in operation and/or management of the facility. Updated plans shall be submitted to the Regional Board within 30 days of revision.

A *Best Management Practices Plan* (BMPP). The purpose of the BMPP is to establish site-specific procedures that will prevent the discharge of pollutants in wastewaters. The BMPP should also address non-storm water discharges from outside the facility. The BMPP shall be site-specific and shall cover all areas of the facility.

B. Compliance Plan

1. Compliance Tasks for Constituents with Interim Limits

i. For those compounds with interim limits established in provision I.B.5, the Discharger shall submit quarterly progress reports to describe the progress of studies and or actions undertaken to reduce these compounds in the effluent, and to achieve compliance with the final effluents limits in this Order by July 1, 2006. The first progress report shall be received by the Regional Board by November 15, 2003.

ii. City of Santa Clarita shall submit within twelve weeks after the adoption of this permit, an engineering work plan detailing how the final limitations contained in this Order will be met. The plan shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

a. An engineering analysis of all water quality data collected since the adoption of the Order, along with an identification of the type of source reductions planned;

b. An evaluation of treatment methods or other corrective actions to be taken to meet the requirements of this Order;

c. A layout of the implementation plan, along with the cost estimates for same;

d. An explanation regarding any additional monitoring that will be required in order to finalize the implementation plan; and,

e. A schedule setting forth compliance implementation dates. There shall be no more than one year between events in the compliance implementation schedule.

iii. The limits stipulated in the Time Schedule Order (TSO) shall be in effect for a period not to extend beyond June 10, 2008. Thereafter, the Discharger shall comply with the limitations specified in Section I.B.3 of this Order.

iv. The Discharger must notify the Regional Board's Executive Officer, in writing, no later than 14 days following each interim date, compliance implementation event, or quarterly report, of the Discharger's compliance or noncompliance with the interim requirements.

2. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR 122.42(a), the Discharger must notify the Board as soon as it knows, or has reason to believe (1) that it has begun or expected to begin, to use or manufacture a toxic pollutant not reported in the permit application, or (2) a discharge of toxic pollutant not limited by this Order has occurred, or will occur, in concentrations that exceed the specified limitations in 40 CFR 122.42(a).

3. In the determination of compliance with the monthly average limitations, the following provisions shall apply to all constituents:

   a. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly or at a lesser frequency, does not exceed the monthly average limit for that constituent, the Discharger will have demonstrated compliance with the monthly average limit for that month.

   b. If the analytical result of a single sample, monitored monthly or at a lesser frequency, exceeds the monthly average limit for any constituent, the Discharger shall collect three additional samples at approximately equal intervals during the month. All four analytical results shall be reported in the monitoring report for that month, or 45 days after the sample was obtained, whichever is later.

      If the numerical average of the analytical result of these four samples does not exceed the monthly average limit for that constituent, compliance with the monthly average limit has been demonstrated for that month. Otherwise, the monthly average limit has been violated.

   c. If Item II.1.b. has not been implemented, and the result of one sample (Item II.1.a) exceeds the monthly average, then the Discharger is in violation of the monthly average limit.

   d. In the event of noncompliance with a monthly average effluent limitation, the sampling frequency for that constituent shall be increased to weekly and shall continue at this level until compliance with the monthly average effluent limitation has been demonstrated.

4. The discharge of any product registered under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to any waste stream which may ultimately be released to waters of the United States, is prohibited unless specifically

authorized elsewhere in this permit or another NPDES permit. This requirement is not applicable to products used for lawn and agricultural purposes.

5. The discharge of any waste resulting from the combustion of toxic or hazardous wastes to any waste stream which ultimately discharges to waters of the United States is prohibited, unless specifically authorized elsewhere in this permit.

6. There shall be no discharge of PCB compounds such as those once commonly used for transformer fluid.

7. The Discharger shall notify the Executive Officer in writing no later than 6 months prior to planned discharge of any chemical, other than chlorine or other product previously reported to the Executive Officer, which may be toxic to aquatic life. Such notification shall include:

    a. Name and general composition of the chemical,
    b. Frequency of use,
    c. Quantities to be used,
    d. Proposed discharge concentrations, and
    e. USEPA registration number, if applicable.

    No discharge of such chemical shall be made prior to the Executive Officer's approval.

8. The Regional Board and USEPA shall be notified immediately by telephone, of the presence of adverse conditions in the receiving waters or on beaches and shores as a result of wastes discharged; written confirmation shall follow as soon as possible but not later than five working days after occurrence.

III. PROVISIONS

A. This Order includes the attached *Standard Provisions and General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements* (Standard Provisions, Attachment N). If there is any conflict between provisions stated herein and the attached Standard Provisions, those provisions stated herein shall prevail.

B. This Order includes the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program No. 6945. If there is any conflict between provisions stated in the Monitoring and Reporting Program and the Standard Provisions, those provisions stated in the former shall prevail.

C. This Order includes the attached *Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Requirements* (Attachment A).

D. This Order may be modified, revoked, reissued, or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR sections 122.44, 122.62, 122.63, 122.64, 125.62 and 125.64. Causes for taking such actions include, but are not limited to: failure to comply with any condition of this Order; endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity; or acquisition of newly-obtained information which would have

justified the application of different conditions if known at the time of Order adoption. The filing of a request by the Discharger for an Order modification, revocation, and issuance or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any condition of this Order.

E. The Discharger must comply with the lawful requirements of municipalities, counties, drainage districts, and other local agencies regarding discharges of storm water to storm drain systems or other water courses under their jurisdiction; including applicable requirements in municipal storm water management program developed to comply with NPDES permits issued by the Regional Board to local agencies.

F. Discharge of wastes to any point other than specifically described in this Order and permit is prohibited and constitutes a violation thereof.

G. The Discharger shall comply with all applicable effluent limitations, national standards of performance, toxic effluent standards, and all federal regulations established pursuant to Sections 301, 302, 303(d), 304, 306, 307, 316, and 423 of the Federal Clean Water Act and amendments thereto.

IV. REOPENERS

A. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with SIP Section 2.2.2.A, to incorporate new limits based on future RPA to be conducted, upon completion of the collection of additional data by the Discharger.

B. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR Parts 122 and 124, to include requirements for the implementation of the watershed management approach.

C. This Order may be reopened and modified, in accordance with the provisions set forth in 40 CFR Parts 122 and 124, to include new minimum levels (MLs) for each pollutant.

D. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise effluent limitations as a result of future Basin Plan Amendments, or the adoption of a TMDL for the Santa Clara River Watershed Management Area.

E. This Order may be reopened upon the submission by the Discharger, of adequate information, as determined by the Regional Board, to provide for dilution credits or a mixing zone, as may be appropriate.

F. This Order may be reopened and modified, to revise the toxicity language once that language becomes standardized.

G. This Order may also be reopened and modified, revoked, and reissued or terminated in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR sections 122.44, 122.62 to 122.64, 125.62, and 125.64. Causes for taking such actions include, but are not limited to, failure to comply with any condition of this order and permit, endangerment to human health or the environment resulting from the permitted activity.

V. EXPIRATION DATE

This Order expires on June 10, 2008.

The Discharger must file a Report of Waste Discharge in accordance with Title 23, California Code of Regulations, not later than 180 days in advance of such date as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements.

VI. RESCISSION

Order No. 96-079, adopted by this Regional Board on November 4, 1996, is hereby rescinded except for enforcement purposes.

I, Jonathan S. Bishop, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, on March 1, 2007.

Jonathan S. Bishop
Executive Officer