

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

364 Knollcrest Drive, #205 Redding, California 96002
Phone (530) 224-4845 O Fax (530) 224-4857

[Central Valley Home Page](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley) (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley)

**TENTATIVE NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES)
CA0083488
ORDER R5-2025-XXXX**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE PARADISE IRRIGATION DISTRICT, PARADISE WATER TREATMENT PLANT,
BUTTE COUNTY**

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

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger:	Paradise Irrigation District
Name of Facility:	Paradise Irrigation District Water Treatment Plant
Facility Street Address:	13888 Pine Needle Drive
Facility City, State, Zip:	Magalia, CA, 95954
Facility County:	Butte

Table 2. Discharge Location

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude (North)	Discharge Point Longitude (West)	Receiving Water
001	Filter Backwash Water	39° 48' 59.5" N	121° 34' 55.7" W	Magalia Reservoir

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was Adopted on:	<Enter Adoption Date>
This Order shall become effective on:	<Enter Effective Date>
This Order shall expire on:	<Enter Expiration Date>
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) as an application for reissuance of WDRs in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), and an application for reissuance of a NPDES permit no later than: < 1-year prior to Order expiration date >	
The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region have classified this discharge as follows: Minor Discharge	

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

PATRICK PULUPA, Executive Officer

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
 TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Facility Information 3
 II. Findings 3
 III. Discharge Prohibitions..... 4
 IV. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications 5
 A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001..... 5
 1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001 5
 B. Land Discharge Specifications – NOT APPLICABLE 6
 V. Receiving Water Limitations 6
 A. Surface Water Limitations..... 6
 B. Groundwater Limitations 9
 VI. Provisions..... 9
 A. Standard Provisions..... 9
 B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements 13
 C. Special Provisions..... 13
 1. Reopener Provisions..... 13
 2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements 15
 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention 15
 4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications..... 15
 5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) – Not
 Applicable 16
 6. Other Special Provisions..... 16
 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable 17
 VII. Compliance Determination 17

TABLES

Table 1. Discharger Information 1
 Table 2. Discharge Location 1
 Table 3. Administrative Information 1
 Table 4. Effluent Limitations 5

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Definitions A-1
 Attachment B – Map B-1
 Attachment C – Flow Schematic..... C-1
 Attachment D – Standard Provisions..... D-1
 Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program E-1
 Attachment F – Fact Sheet..... F-1
 Attachment G – Summary Of Reasonable Potential Analysis G-1
 Attachment H-1 – Calculation of WQBELS..... H-1
 Attachment H-2 – Calculation of WQBELS..... H-2

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the Paradise Irrigation District (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility's permit application.

II. FINDINGS

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

- A. Legal Authorities.** This Order serves as waste discharge requirements (WDRs) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit authorizing the Discharger to discharge into waters of the United States at the discharge location described in Table 2 subject to the WDRs in this Order.
- B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of CEQA, (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of Public Resources Code. Additionally, the adoption of land discharge requirements for the Facility constituents permitting of an existing facility that is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to CCR, title 14, section 15301.
- C. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Central Valley Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order, is hereby incorporated into and constitutes Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G through H are also incorporated into this Order.
- D. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections **IV.B, IV.C, V.B, and IV.C** 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.
- E. Monitoring and Reporting.** 40 C.F.R. section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. This Order and the Monitoring and Reporting Program, provided in Attachment E, establish monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State

requirements. The burden, including costs, of these monitoring and reporting requirements bears a reasonable relationship to the need for these reports and the benefits to be obtained therefrom. The Discharger, as owner and operator of the Facility, is responsible for these requirements, which are necessary to determine compliance with this Order. The need for these requirements is further discussed in the Fact Sheet, Attachment F.

- F. Notification of Interested Persons.** The Central Valley Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.
- G. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Central Valley Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R5-2020-0016 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Central Valley Water Board from taking enforcement action for violations of the previous Order.

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A.** Discharge of wastewater from the Facility, as the Facility is specifically described in the Fact Sheet in section II.B, in a manner different from that described in this Order 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 Water Code.
- D.** Discharge of waste classified as 'hazardous', as defined in the CCR, title 22, section 66261.1 et seq., is prohibited.
- E. Average Flow.** Discharges exceeding an average discharge flow of 0.6 million gallons per day (MGD) are prohibited.

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 Discharge Point 001. Unless otherwise specified compliance shall be measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 and EFF-002, as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E:

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

Table 4. Effluent Limitations

Parameters	Units	Average Monthly	Maximum Daily
Settleable Solids	Milligrams per liter (mg/L)	0.1	0.2
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	30	50
Dichlorobromomethane	Micrograms per liter (µg/L)	4	7.5

- b. **pH:**
 - i. 6.5 Standard Units (SU) as an instantaneous minimum.
 - ii. 8.5 SU as an instantaneous maximum.
- c. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity MDEL.** No chronic aquatic toxicity test shall result in a “Fail” at the Instream Waste Concentration (IWC) for the sub-lethal endpoint measured in the test AND a percent effect for the survival endpoint greater than or equal to 50 percent.
- d. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity MMEL.** No more than one chronic aquatic toxicity test initiated in a toxicity calendar month shall result in a “Fail” at the IWC for any endpoint.
- e. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:
 - i. 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
 - ii. 0.019 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.
- f. **Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos.** Effluent diazinon and chlorpyrifos concentrations shall not exceed the sum of one (1.0) as identified below:

i. Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

$$\text{SAMEL} = \text{CD M-avg}/0.079 + \text{CC M-avg}/0.012 \leq 1.0$$

CD M-AVG = average monthly diazinon effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$.

CC M-AVG = average monthly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$

ii. Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

$$\text{SAWEL} = \text{CD W-avg}/0.14 + \text{CC W-avg}/0.021 \leq 1.0$$

CD W-AVG = average weekly diazinon effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$.

CC W-AVG = average weekly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$.

B. Land Discharge Specifications – NOT APPLICABLE

V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water Limitations

The discharge shall not cause the following in Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek:

1. **Bacteria.** The six-week rolling geometric mean of Escherichia coli (E. coli) to exceed 100 colony forming units (cfu) per 100 milliliters (mL), calculated weekly, and a statistical threshold value (STV) of 320 cfu/100 mL to be exceeded by more than 10 percent of the samples collected in a calendar month, calculated in a static manner.
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.
6. **Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. **Oil and Grease.** Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.
9. **Pesticides:**
 - a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
 - b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
 - c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by U.S. EPA or the Executive Officer;
 - d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR section 131.12.);
 - e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable;
 - f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) set forth in CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 15; nor
 - g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.
10. **Radioactivity:**
 - a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life; nor

- b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the MCLs specified in Table 64442 of section 64442 and Table 64443 of section 64443 of Title 22 of the CCR.
11. **Salinity.** Electrical conductivity (at 25°C) shall not exceed 230 µmhos/cm (50th percentile) or 235 µmhos/cm (90th percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain or 240 µmhos/cm (50th percentile) or 340 µmhos/cm (90th percentile) at I Street Bridge, based upon previous 10 years of record.
12. **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.
13. **Settleable Substances.** Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
14. **Suspended Material.** Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
15. **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.
16. **Temperature.** The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5° Fahrenheit. Compliance to be determined based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.
17. **Toxicity.** Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
18. **Turbidity.**
 - a. Shall not exceed 2 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU) where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU;
 - b. Shall not increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs;
 - c. Shall not increase more than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs;
 - d. Shall not increase more than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs; nor

- e. Shall not increase more than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

B. Groundwater Limitations

Release of waste constituents from any portion of the Facility shall not cause groundwater to:

- 1. Exceed a total coliform organism level of 2.2 MPN/100 mL over any seven-day period.
- 2. Contain constituents in concentrations that exceed either the Primary or Secondary MCLs established in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
- 3. Contain taste or odor-producing constituents, toxic substances, or any other constituents in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

- 1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D.
- 2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:
 - a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, division 3, chapter 26.
 - b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:
 - i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;
 - ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;
 - iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and
 - iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under the Central Valley Water Board Standard Provision contained in section VI.A.2.i of this Order.

The technical report shall:

- i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.
- iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Central Valley Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions 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.

- k. A publicly owned treatment works whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Central Valley Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.
- l. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with 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.

- m. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- n. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board.
- o. This Order may be reopened to transfer ownership of control of this Order. The succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the state of incorporation if a corporation, address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Central Valley Water Board, and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory and certification requirements in the federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D, section V.B) and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order.
- p. If the Discharger submits a timely and complete ROWD for permit reissuance, this permit shall continue in force and effect until the permit is reissued or the Regional Water Board rescinds the permit.
- q. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements

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

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR section 122.62, including, but not limited to:

- i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.
 - ii. When new information, that was not available at the time of permit issuance, would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
- b. This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not limited to, fish tissue sampling, 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.
- c. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened, and the mass effluent limitation modified (higher or lower) or an effluent concentration limitation imposed. If the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the mercury mass loading limitation(s) and the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** If after review of new data and information, it is determined that the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream exceedance of the Statewide Toxicity Provisions numeric chronic and/or acute aquatic toxicity objectives this Order may be reopened and effluent limitations added for acute and/or chronic toxicity.
- e. **Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS).** On 17 January 2020, certain Basin Plan Amendments to incorporate new strategies for addressing ongoing salt and nitrate accumulation in the Central Valley became effective. Other provisions subject to U.S. EPA approval became effective on 2 November 2020, when approved by U.S. EPA. As the Central Valley Water Board moves forward to implement those provisions that are now in effect, this Order may be amended or modified to incorporate new or modified requirements necessary for implementation of the Basin Plan Amendments. More information regarding these Amendments can be found on the [Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability \(CV-SALTS\)](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/salinity/) web page:
(https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/salinity/)

2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Requirements.

- i. **TRE:** The Discharger is required to initiate a TRE, as detailed in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E, Section V.F), when any combination of two or more **MDEL or MMEL** exceedances occur within a single toxicity calendar month or within two successive toxicity calendar months. In addition, if other information indicates toxicity (e.g., results of additional monitoring, results of monitoring at a higher concentration than the IWC, fish kills, intermittent recurring toxicity) or if there is no effluent available to complete a routine monitoring test or **MMEL** compliance test, the Executive Officer may require a TRE.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP).** The Discharger submitted a Notice of Intent to comply with the Salt Control Program and selected the Alternative Permitting Approach. Accordingly, the Discharger shall participate in the CV-SALTS Prioritization and Optimization (P&O) Study. Furthermore, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the SEMP shall be submitted with the ROWD. The evaluation shall include, at minimum, the calendar annual average concentrations of effluent electrical conductivity during the term of the Order.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

a. Settling/Drying Pond Operation Requirements.

- i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
- ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
- iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular.
 - (a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.
 - (b) Weeds shall be minimized.

- (c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
- vii. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- viii. 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 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- ix. Freeboard in the emergency storage ponds shall not be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow), except if lesser freeboard does not threaten the integrity of the pond, no overflow of the pond occurs, and lesser freeboard is due to direct precipitation or storm water runoff occurring as a result of annual precipitation with greater than a 100-year recurrence interval, or a storm event with an intensity greater than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.
- x. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with the operating specification contained at section vii above.
- xi. The monthly average discharge flow shall not exceed 0.6 mgd.
- xii. 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/settling ponds is prohibited.
- xiii. 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).
- xiv. Ponds shall not have a pH less than 6.5 or greater than 8.5.

5. Special Provisions for Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) – Not Applicable

6. Other Special Provisions

- a. **Solids Discharge Specifications.** Collected screenings, residual sludge, solids from settling basins/drying ponds, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner 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, storage, disposal, or reuse at sites (e.g., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a Regional Water Board will satisfy these specifications.

- b. Solids Management Plan.** The Discharger shall submit a Solids Management Plan according to the schedule in Technical Reports Table E-7, that shall describe at a minimum:
- i. Sources and amounts of settling/drying pond solids generated annually.
 - ii. Location(s) of on-site storage and description of the containment area.
 - iii. Plans for ultimate disposal. For landfill disposal, include the present classification, name, and location of landfill.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

- A. TSS and Settleable Solids Effluent Limitations (sections IV.A.1.a.).** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for TSS and settleable solids required in Waste Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a. shall be ascertained by grab samples. Any excursion above the average monthly and/or maximum daily effluent limitations is a violation
- B. Average Dry Weather Flow Prohibition (section III.E.).** Compliance with the average flow prohibition will be determined based on the average daily flow when discharging to Magalia Reservoir. The average daily flow is determined by dividing the total volume of flow discharged by the number of days discharged to the Magalia Reservoir occurred during the month.
- C. Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations (section IV.A.1.e.).** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for total chlorine residual shall be ascertained by grab samples.

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

- D. Priority Pollutant Effluent Limitations.** Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants shall be determined in accordance with section 2.4.5 of the SIP, as follows:
1. Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reporting level (RL).
 2. Dischargers shall be required to conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) in accordance with section 2.4.5.1 of the SIP when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:
 - a. sample result is reported as detected, but not quantified (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or
 - b. sample result is reported as non-detect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL).
 3. When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and more than one sample result is available in a month, the discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
 - a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
 - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
 4. If a sample result, or the arithmetic mean or median of multiple sample results, is below the RL, and there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and the discharger conducts a PMP (as described in section 2.4.5.1), the discharger shall **not** be deemed out of compliance.
- E. Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitation (section V.A.6.a-c).** Weekly receiving water monitoring is required in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) and is sufficient to evaluate the impacts of the discharge and compliance with this Order. Weekly receiving water monitoring data, measured at

monitoring locations RSW-001 and RSW-002, will be used to determine compliance with part “c” of the dissolved oxygen receiving water limitation to ensure the discharge does not cause the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time. However, should more frequent dissolved oxygen and temperature receiving water monitoring be conducted, Central Valley Water Board staff may evaluate compliance with parts “a” and “b”.

- F. Whole Effluent Toxicity Effluent Limitations.** The discharge is subject to determination of “Pass” or “Fail” from chronic whole effluent toxicity tests using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) statistical t-test approach described in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1 and Table A-1 (Chronic Freshwater and East Coast Methods) and Appendix B, Table B-1.

The null hypothesis (Ho) for the TST statistical approach is:

Mean discharge Instream Waste Concentration (IWC) response \leq Regulatory Management Decision (RMD) x Mean control response, where the chronic RMD = 0.75.

A test result that rejects this null hypothesis is reported as “Pass.” A test result that does not reject this null hypothesis is reported as “Fail.”

The relative “Percent Effect” at the discharge IWC is defined and reported as:

Percent Effect = ((Mean control response – Mean discharge IWC response) / Mean control response) x 100.

This is a t-test (formally Student’s t-Test), a statistical analysis comparing two sets of replicate observations, i.e., a control and IWC. The purpose of this statistical test is to determine if the means of the two sets of observations are different (i.e., if the IWC differs from the control, the test result is “Pass” or “Fail”). The Welch’s t-test employed by the TST statistical approach is an adaptation of Student’s t-test and is used with two samples having unequal variances.

- 1. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity MDEL (section IV.A.1.f.).** If the result of a routine chronic whole effluent toxicity test, using the TST statistical approach, is a “Fail” at the IWC for the sublethal endpoint measured in the test and the percent effect for the sublethal endpoint is greater than or equal to 50 percent, the Discharger will be deemed out of compliance with the MDEL.
- 2. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity MMEL (section IV.A.1.g.).** If the result of a routine chronic whole effluent toxicity test, using the TST statistical approach, is a “Fail” at the IWC, the Discharger shall conduct a maximum of two additional MMEL compliance tests during the calendar month. If one of the additional MMEL compliance test results in a “Fail” at the IWC, the Discharger will be deemed out of compliance with the MMEL.

ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

1Q10

The lowest one-day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years.

7Q10

The lowest average seven consecutive day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years.

Acute Aquatic Toxicity Test

A test to determine an adverse effect (usually lethality) on a group of aquatic test organisms during a short-term exposure (e.g., 24, 48, or 96 hours).

Alternative Hypothesis

A statement used to propose a statistically significant relationship in a set of given observations. Under the TST approach, when the Null Hypothesis is rejected, the Alternative Hypothesis is accepted in its place, indicating a relationship between variables and an acceptable level of toxicity.

Arithmetic Mean (μ)

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

$$\text{Arithmetic mean} = \mu = \Sigma x / n$$

where: Σx is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and n is the number of samples.

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

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

Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

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

Bioaccumulative

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

Calendar Month(s)

A period of time from a day of one month to the day before the corresponding day of the next month if the corresponding day exists, or if not to the last day of the next month (e.g., from January 1 to January 31, from June 15 to July 14, or from January 31 to February 28).

Calendar Quarter

A period of time defined as three consecutive calendar months.

Calendar Year

A period of time defined as twelve consecutive calendar months.

Chronic Aquatic Toxicity Test

A test to determine an adverse effect (sub-lethal or lethal) on a group of aquatic test organisms during an exposure of duration long enough to assess sub-lethal effects.

Carcinogenic

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

Coefficient of Variation (CV)

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

Daily Discharge

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

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

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

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

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

Dilution Credit

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

Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)

ECA is a value derived from the water quality criterion/objective, dilution credit, and ambient background concentration that is used, in conjunction with the coefficient of variation for the effluent monitoring data, to calculate a long-term average (LTA) discharge concentration. The

ECA has the same meaning as waste load allocation (WLA) as used in U.S. EPA guidance (Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control, March 1991, second printing, EPA/505/2-90-001).

Enclosed Bays

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

Endpoint

An effect that is measured in a toxicity study. Endpoints in toxicity tests may include, but are not limited to survival, reproduction, and growth. A measured response of a receptor to a stressor. An endpoint can be measured in a toxicity test or field survey.

Estimated Chemical Concentration

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

Estuaries

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

Inland Surface Waters

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

Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation

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

Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation

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

Instream Waste Concentration (IWC)

The concentration of effluent in the receiving water after mixing.

Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

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

Median

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

Method Detection Limit (MDL)

MDL is the minimum measured concentration of a substance that can be reported with 99 percent confidence that the measured concentration is distinguishable from method blank results, as defined in in 40 C.F.R. Part 136, Attachment B.

Minimum Level (ML)

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

Mixing Zone

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

Not Detected (ND)

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

Null Hypothesis

A statement used in statistical testing that has been put forward either because it is believed to be true or because it is to be used as a basis for argument, but has not been proved.

Ocean Waters

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

Percent Effect

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

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

Persistent Pollutants

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

Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

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

Pollution Prevention

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

Regulatory Management Decision (RMD)

The decision that represents the maximum allowable error rates and thresholds for toxicity and non-toxicity that would result in an acceptable risk to aquatic life.

Response

A measured biological effect (e.g., survival, reproduction, growth) as a result of exposure to a stimulus.

Satellite Collection System

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

Source of Drinking Water

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

Species Sensitivity Screening

An analysis to determine the single most sensitive species from an array of test species to be used in a single species laboratory test series.

Standard Deviation (σ)

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

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

where:

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

Statewide Toxicity Provisions

Refers to section III.B and section IV.B of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California.

Statistical Threshold Value (STV)

The STV for the bacteria receiving water limitation is a set value that approximates the 90th percentile of the water quality distribution of a bacterial population.

Test of Significant Toxicity (TST)

A statistical approach used to analyze aquatic toxicity test data, as described in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1 and Table A-1 (Chronic Freshwater and East Coast Methods) and Appendix B, Table B-1.

Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

TRE is a study conducted in a stepwise 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.)

WET Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

For the purposes of chronic and acute aquatic toxicity, an MDEL is an effluent limitation based on the outcome of the TST approach and the resulting percent effect at the IWC.

WET Median Monthly Effluent Limit (MMEL)

For the purposes of chronic and acute aquatic toxicity, an MMEL is an effluent limitation based on a maximum of three independent toxicity tests analyzed using the TST approach during a calendar month.

WET Maximum Daily Effluent Target (MDET)

For the purposes of chronic aquatic toxicity, an MDET is a target used to determine whether a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) should be conducted. Not meeting the MDET is not a violation of an effluent limitation.

WET Median Monthly Effluent Target (MMET)

For the purposes of chronic aquatic toxicity, an MMET is a target based on a maximum of three independent toxicity tests used to determine whether a TRE should be conducted. Not meeting the MMET is not a violation of an effluent limitation.


WET MMEL Compliance Tests

For the purposes of chronic and acute aquatic toxicity, a maximum of two tests that are used in addition to the routine monitoring test to determine compliance with the chronic and acute aquatic toxicity MMEL.


WET MMET Tests

For the purposes of chronic aquatic toxicity, for dischargers not required to comply with numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, MMET Tests are a maximum of two tests that are used in addition to the routine monitoring test to determine whether a TRE should be conducted.

ATTACHMENT B – MAP



ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC



ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply:

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the terms, requirements, and conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action; permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(a); Wat. Code, sections 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 13001, 13304, 13350, 13385.)
2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 122.41(c).)

C. Duty to Mitigate

The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of this Order that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. (40 C.F.R. section 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 having 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. section 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. section 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. section 122.5(c).)

F. Inspection and Entry

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

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C section 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(i)(1); Wat. Code, sections 13267, 13383);
2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. section 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(i)(2); Wat. Code, sections 13267, 13383);
3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (33 U.S.C section 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(i)(3); Wat. Code, section 13267, 13383); and
4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (33 U.S.C section 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(i)(4); Wat. Code, sections 13267, 13383.)

G. Bypass

1. Definitions
 - a. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 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. section 122.41(m)(2).)

3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Central Valley Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4)(i)):
 - a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
 - c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Central Valley Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)
4. The Central Valley Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Central Valley Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)
5. **Notice**
 - a. **Anticipated bypass.** If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit prior notice if possible, at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. The notice shall be sent to the Central Valley Water Board. As of 21 December 2023, all notices shall be [submitted electronically to the initial recipient](#) (State Water Board’s California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program website (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/), defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J below. Notices shall comply with 40 C.F.R. Part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. Part 127. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(3)(i).)
 - b. **Unanticipated bypass.** The Discharger shall submit a notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). The notice shall be sent to the Central Valley Water Board. As of 21 December 2023, all notices shall be submitted electronically to the initial recipient (State Water Board’s California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) [Program website](#), (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/), defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J below. Notices shall comply with

40 C.F.R. Part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. Part 127. (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 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. section 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. section 122.41(n)(3)):
 - a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(n)(3)(i));
 - b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 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. section 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. section 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. section 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. section 122.41(b).)

C. Transfers

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Central Valley Water Board. The Central Valley Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and the Water Code. (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 122.41(j)(1).)

B. Monitoring must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. Part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O. Monitoring must be conducted according to sufficiently sensitive test methods approved under 40 C.F.R. Part 136 for the analysis of pollutants or pollutant parameters or as required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O. For the purposes of this paragraph, a method is sufficiently sensitive when the method has the lowest ML of the analytical methods approved under 40 C.F.R. Part 136 or required under 40 C.F.R. chapter 1, subchapter N or O for the measured pollutant or pollutant parameter, or when:

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

high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of the pollutant or pollutant parameter in the discharge.

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

IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

- A.** Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Discharger's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. part 503), the Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 122.41(j)(3)(i));
 2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
 3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
 4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
 5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
 6. The results of such analyses. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)
- C.** Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 C.F.R. section 122.7(b)):
1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 C.F.R. section 122.7(b)(1)); and

2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data.
(40 C.F.R. section 122.7(b)(2).)

V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

A. Duty to Provide Information

The Discharger shall furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(h); Wat. Code, sections 13267, 13383.)

B. Signatory and Certification Requirements

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, V.B.5, and V.B.6 below. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(k).)
2. All permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of U.S. EPA). (40 C.F.R. section 122.22(a)(3).)
3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
 - a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 122.22(b)(2)); and

- c. The written authorization is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. section 122.22(b)(3).)
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 122.22(d).)
6. Any person providing the electronic signature for such documents described in Standard Provision – V.B.1, V.B.2, or V.B.3 that are submitted electronically shall meet all relevant requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B, and shall ensure that all of the relevant requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 3 (Cross-Media Electronic Reporting) and 40 C.F.R. part 127 (NPDES Electronic Reporting Requirements) are met for that submission. (40 C.F.R section 122.22(e).)

C. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(l)(4).)
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board for reporting the results of monitoring, sludge use, or disposal practices. As of 21 December 2016, all reports and forms must be submitted electronically to the initial recipient, defined in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.J, and comply with 40 C.F.R. part 3, section 122.22, and 40 C.F.R. part 127. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another

method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Central Valley Water Board. (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 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. section 122.41(l)(5).)

E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance which may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A report shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The report shall contain a description of the 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.

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

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

F. Planned Changes

The Discharger shall give notice to the Central Valley Water Board as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required under this provision only when (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 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 subject neither to effluent limitations in this Order nor to notification requirements under section 122.42(a)(1) (see Additional Provisions— Notification Levels VII.A.1). (40 C.F.R. section 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. section 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

G. Anticipated Noncompliance

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Central Valley Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. section 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. For noncompliance events related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events, these reports shall contain the information described in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E and the applicable required data in appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 127. The Central Valley Water Board may also require the Discharger to electronically submit reports not related to combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows, or bypass events under this section. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(l)(7).)

I. Other Information

When the Discharger becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the

Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. section 122.41(l)(8).)

J. Initial Recipient for Electronic Reporting Data

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

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

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

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

A. Non-Municipal Facilities

Existing manufacturing, commercial, mining, and silvicultural Dischargers shall notify the Central Valley Water Board as soon as they know or have reason to believe (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)):

1. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in the discharge, on a routine or frequent basis, of any toxic pollutant that is not limited in this Order, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following "notification levels" (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(1)):
 - a. 100 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(1)(i));
 - b. 200 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for acrolein and acrylonitrile; 500 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for 2,4-dinitrophenol and 2-methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol; and 1 milligram per liter (mg/L) for antimony (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(1)(ii));
 - c. Five (5) times the maximum concentration value reported for that pollutant in the Report of Waste Discharge (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(1)(iii)); or
 - d. The level established by the Central Valley Water Board in accordance with section 122.44(f). (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(1)(iv).)

2. That any activity has occurred or will occur that would result in the discharge, on a non-routine or infrequent basis, of any toxic pollutant that is not limited in this Order, if that discharge will exceed the highest of the following "notification levels" (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(2)):
 - a. 500 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(2)(i));
 - b. 1 milligram per liter (mg/L) for antimony (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(2)(ii));
 - c. Ten (10) times the maximum concentration value reported for that pollutant in the Report of Waste Discharge (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(2)(iii)); or
 - d. The level established by the Central Valley Water Board in accordance with section 122.44(f). (40 C.F.R. section 122.42(a)(2)(iv).)

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Table of Contents

I. General Monitoring Provisions..... E-2

II. Monitoring Locations E-3

III. Influent Monitoring Requirements..... E-4

 A. Monitoring Location INF-001..... E-4

IV. Effluent Monitoring Requirements E-4

 A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 and EFF-002..... E-4

V. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements E-6

VI. Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable E-12

VII. Recycling Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable E-12

VIII. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements E-12

 A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 and RSW-002..... E-12

IX. Other Monitoring Requirements..... E-14

 A. Solids Monitoring – Not Applicable E-14

 B. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization E-14

X. Reporting Requirements..... E-19

 A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements..... E-19

 B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) E-20

 C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) E-23

 D. Other Reports E-23

Tables

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations E-3

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring..... E-4

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring E-5

Table E-4. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements E-12

Table E-5. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring E-15

Table E-6. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule E-20

Table E-7. Technical Reports E-25

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 C.F.R. section 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and California requirements.

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

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

continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.

- E. Monitoring results, including noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- F. Laboratory analytical methods shall be sufficiently sensitive in accordance with the Sufficiently Sensitive Methods Rule (SSM Rule) specified under 40 C.F.R. 122.21(e)(3) and 122.44(i)(1)(iv). A U.S. EPA-approved analytical method is sufficiently sensitive for a pollutant/parameter where:
 1. The method minimum level (ML) is at or below the applicable water quality objective for the receiving water, or;
 2. The method ML is above the applicable water quality objective for the receiving water but the amount of the pollutant/parameter in the discharge is high enough that the method detects and quantifies the level of the pollutant/parameter, or;
 3. the method ML is above the applicable water quality objective for the receiving water, but the ML is the lowest of the 40 C.F.R. 136 U.S. EPA-approved analytical methods for the pollutant/parameter.
- H. The Discharger shall file with the Central Valley Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this 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	Influent Weir. Latitude: 39.83386 - Longitude: 121.58142
001	EFF-001	Effluent Old Pond. Latitude: 39.81608 - Longitude: -121.57979
001	EFF-002	Effluent New Pond. Latitude: 39.816528 - Longitude: -121.582139
--	RSW-001	Little Butte Creek/Magalia Reservoir, approximately 0.5 miles upstream of Discharge 001
--	RSW-002	Little Butte Creek, approximately 50 feet downstream of the water treatment plant
--	PND-001	Old Pond
--	PND-002	New Pond

Table E-1 Note:

1. The North latitude and West longitude information in Table E-1 are approximate for administrative purposes.

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

1. The Discharger shall monitor influent weir at INF-001 in accordance with Table E-2 and the testing requirements described in section III.A.2 below:

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring

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

2. **Table E-2 Testing Requirements.** The Discharger shall comply with the following testing requirements when monitoring for the parameters described in Table E-2:
 - a. **Applicable to all parameters.** Parameters shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR part 136; or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board. In addition, if requested by the Discharger, the sample type may be modified by the Executive Officer to another 40 CFR part 136 allowed sample type.
 - b. **Grab Samples.** All grab samples shall not be collected at the same time each day to get a complete representation of variations in the influent.
 - c. **Standard Minerals** shall include: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series: bicarbonate, carbonate and hydroxide), hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 and EFF-002

1. The Discharger shall monitor filter backwash water at EFF-001 and EFF-002 in accordance with Table E-3 and the testing requirements described in section IV.A.2 below:

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	Meter	1/Week
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Week
Turbidity	NTUs	Grab	1/Week
Settleable Solids	ml/L	Grab	2/Month
Suspended Solids	mg/L	Grab	2/Month
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°Celcius	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/Month
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter
Dissolved Organic Carbon	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter
Hardness, Total (as CaCO3)	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter
Chlorpyrifos	µg/L	Grab	1/Year
Diazinon	µg/L	Grab	1/Year
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	(see section IX.B)	(see section IX.B)	(see section IX.B)
Whole Effluent Toxicity	(see section V)	(see section V)	(see section V)

2. **Table E-3 Testing Requirements.** The Discharger shall comply with the following testing requirements when monitoring for the parameters described in Table E-3:
 - a. **Applicable to all parameters.** Parameters shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board. In addition, if requested by the Discharger, the sample type may be modified by the Executive Officer to another 40 CFR part 136 allowed sample type.
 - b. **24-hour composite samples** shall be collected from a 24-hour flow proportional composite.
 - c. **Handheld Field Meter.** A handheld field meter may be used for **temperature** and **pH**, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.
 - d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Ammonia samples shall be collected concurrently with whole effluent toxicity monitoring.

- e. **Total Residual Chlorine** must be monitored using an analytical method that is sufficiently sensitive to measure at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L.
 - f. **Hardness** samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.
 - g. **Aluminum.** Aluminum shall be analyzed using either total or acid-soluble (inductively coupled plasma/atomic emission spectrometry or inductively coupled plasma/mass spectrometry) analysis methods, as supported by U.S. EPA's Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum document (EPA 440/5-86-008), or other standard methods that exclude aluminum silicate particles as approved by the Executive Officer.
 - h. **Priority Pollutants.** For all priority pollutant constituents listed in Table E-3 (Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides and Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern) the RL shall be consistent with sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP) and the SSM Rule specified under 40 C.F.R. sections 122.21(e)(3) and 122.44(i)(1)(iv).
 - i. **Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon** shall be sampled using U.S. EPA Method 625M, Method 8141, or equivalent GC/MS method with a lower Reporting Limit than the Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives of 0.015 µg/L and 0.1 µg/L for chlorpyrifos and diazinon, respectively.
 - j. **Dissolved Organic Carbon monitoring** shall be conducted concurrently with pH and hardness sampling.
 - k. **Whole Effluent Toxicity monitoring** shall be in accordance with section V of this MRP.
3. **Intermittent Discharge.** If the discharge is intermittent rather than continuous, then on the first day of each such intermittent discharge, the Discharger shall monitor and record for all of the constituents listed above, after which the frequencies of analysis given in the schedule shall apply for the duration of each such intermittent discharge. In no event shall the Discharger be required to monitor and record data more often than twice the frequencies listed in the schedule.

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Toxicity Calendar Month, Quarter and Year.

- 1. **Toxicity Calendar Month.** The toxicity calendar month is defined as the period of time beginning on the day of the initiation of the routine toxicity monitoring to the day before the corresponding day of the next month if the corresponding day exists, or if not to the last day of the next month.

2. **Toxicity Calendar Quarter.** A toxicity calendar quarter is defined as **three consecutive toxicity calendar months**. For purposes of this Order, the toxicity calendar quarters **begin on 1 January, 1 April, 1 July, and 1 October** (i.e., from 1 January to 31 March, from 1 April to 30 June, from 1 July to 30 September, from 1 October to 31 December).
 3. **Toxicity Calendar Year.** A toxicity calendar year is defined as **twelve consecutive toxicity calendar months**. For purposes of this Order, the toxicity calendar year **begins on 1 January** (i.e., 1 January to 31 December), in years in which there are at least 15 days of discharge in at least one toxicity calendar quarter.
- B. Chronic Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:
1. **Instream Waste Concentration (IWC) for Chronic Toxicity.** The chronic toxicity IWC is 100 percent effluent.
 2. **Routine Monitoring Frequency.** The Discharger shall perform routine chronic toxicity testing once per toxicity calendar quarter in quarters in which there are at least 15 days of discharge. While the Discharger is conducting a toxicity reduction evaluation the routine monitoring may be reduced to two (2) tests per toxicity calendar year.
 3. **Chronic Toxicity MMEL Compliance Testing.** If a routine chronic toxicity monitoring test results in a “fail” at the IWC, then a maximum of two chronic toxicity MMEL compliance tests shall be completed. The chronic toxicity MMEL compliance tests shall be initiated within the same toxicity calendar month that the routine monitoring chronic toxicity test was initiated that resulted in the “fail” at the IWC. If the first chronic toxicity MMEL compliance test results in a “fail” at the IWC, then the second chronic toxicity MMEL compliance test is unnecessary and is waived.
 4. **Additional Routine Monitoring Tests for TRE Determination.** In order to determine if a TRE is necessary an additional routine monitoring test is required when there is one violation of the chronic toxicity MDEL or MMEL, but not two violations in a single toxicity calendar month. This additional routine monitoring test is not required if the Discharger is already conducting a TRE. This additional routine monitoring test shall be initiated within two weeks after the end of the toxicity calendar month in which the MMEL or MDEL violation occurred. The toxicity calendar month of the violation and the toxicity calendar month of the additional routine monitoring shall be considered “successive calendar months” for purposes of determining whether a TRE is required. This additional routine monitoring test is also used for compliance purposes, and could result in the need to conduct MMEL compliance testing per section V.B.3 above.

5. **Sample Volumes.** Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.
6. **Test Species.** The testing shall be conducted using the most sensitive species. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with water flea (*Ceriodaphnia dubia*), unless otherwise specified in writing by the Executive Officer.
7. **Test Methods.** Discharger shall conduct the chronic toxicity tests on effluent samples at the instream waste concentration for the discharge in accordance with species and test methods in Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms (EPA/821/R02/013, 2002; Table IA, 40 C.F.R. part 136).
8. **Dilution and Control Water.** Dilution water and control water shall be prepared and used as specified in the test methods manual. If dilution water and control water is different from test organism culture water, then a second control using culture water shall also be used.
9. **Test Failure.** If the effluent chronic toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria (TAC) specified in the referenced test method in EPA/821-R-02-013, the Discharger must conduct a Replacement Test as soon as possible, as specified in subsection B.10, below.
10. **Replacement Test.** When a required toxicity test for routine monitoring or MMEL compliance tests is not completed, a new toxicity test to replace the toxicity test that was not completed shall be initiated as soon as possible. The new toxicity test shall replace the routine monitoring or MMEL compliance tests, as applicable, for the toxicity calendar month in which the toxicity test that was not completed was required to be initiated, even if the new toxicity test is initiated in a subsequent month. The new toxicity test for routine monitoring or MMEL compliance tests, as applicable, and any MMEL compliance tests required to be conducted due to the results of the new toxicity test shall be used to determine compliance with the effluent limitations for the toxicity calendar month in which the toxicity test that was not completed was required to be initiated. The new toxicity test and any MMEL compliance tests required to be conducted due to the results of the new toxicity test shall not be used to substitute for any other required toxicity tests.

Any specific monitoring event is not required to be initiated in the required time period when the Central Valley Water Board staff determines that the test was not initiated in the required time period due to circumstances outside of the Discharger's control that were not preventable with the reasonable exercise of care, and the Discharger promptly initiates, and ultimately completes, a replacement test

- C. Quality Assurance and Additional Requirements.** Quality assurance measures, instructions, and other recommendations and requirements are found in the test methods manual previously referenced. Additional requirements are below.
1. The discharge is subject to determination of “Pass” or “Fail” from a chronic toxicity test using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) statistical t-test approach described in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1 and Table A-1 (Chronic Freshwater and East Coast Methods) and Appendix B, Table B-1.
 2. The null hypothesis (Ho) for the TST statistical approach is:

Mean discharge IWC response \leq RMD x Mean control response, where the chronic RMD = 0.75.

A test result that rejects this null hypothesis is reported as “Pass.” A test result that does not reject this null hypothesis is reported as “Fail.”
 3. The relative “Percent Effect” at the discharge IWC is defined and reported as:

Percent Effect = ((Mean control response – Mean discharge IWC response) / Mean control response) x 100.

This is a t-test (formally Student’s t-Test), a statistical analysis comparing two sets of replicate observations, i.e., a control and IWC. The purpose of this statistical test is to determine if the means of the two sets of observations are different (i.e., if the IWC or receiving water concentration differs from the control, the test result is “Pass” or “Fail”). The Welch’s t-test employed by the TST statistical approach is an adaptation of Student’s t-test and is used with two samples having unequal variances.
- D. WET Testing Notification Requirements.** The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board of test results exceeding the chronic toxicity effluent limitation as soon as the Discharger learns of the exceedance, but no later than 24-hours after receipt of the monitoring results.
- E. WET Testing Reporting Requirements.** The Discharger shall submit the full laboratory report for all toxicity testing as an attachment to CIWQS for the reporting period (e.g., monthly, quarterly, semi-annually or annually) and provide the data (i.e., Pass/Fail) in the PET tool for uploading into CIWQS. The laboratory report shall include:
1. The valid toxicity test results for the TST statistical approach, reported as “Pass” or “Fail” and “Percent Effect” at the IWC for the discharge, the dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test, all results for effluent parameters monitored concurrently with the toxicity test(s); and progress reports on TRE investigations.

2. The statistical analysis used in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010) Appendix A, Figure A-1 and Table A-1, and Appendix B, Table B-1.
3. Statistical program (e.g., TST calculator, CETIS, etc.) output results, including graphical plots, for each toxicity test.

F. Most Sensitive Species Screening. The Discharger shall perform rescreening to re-evaluate the most sensitive species. **The species sensitivity screening shall be conducted as follows and the results submitted with the Report of Waste Discharge.**

1. **Frequency of Testing for Species Sensitivity Screening.** Species sensitivity screening for chronic toxicity shall include, at a minimum, chronic WET testing four consecutive calendar quarters using the water flea (*Ceriodaphnia dubia*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), and green algae (*Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*). The tests shall be performed at an IWC of no less than 100 percent effluent.
2. **Determination of Most Sensitive Species.** If a single test in the species sensitivity screening testing results in a “Fail” using the TST statistical approach, then the species used in that test shall be established as the most sensitive species. If there is more than a single test that results in a “Fail”, then of the species with results of a “Fail”, the species that exhibits the highest percent effect shall be established as the most sensitive species. If none of the tests in the species sensitivity screening results in a “Fail”, but at least one of the species exhibits a percent effect greater than **10** percent, then the single species that exhibits the highest percent effect shall be established as the most sensitive species. In all other circumstances, the Executive Officer shall have discretion to determine which single species is the most sensitive considering the test results from the species sensitivity screening. For subsequent species sensitivity screening, if the first two subsequent screening events result in no change in the most sensitive species, the Discharger may cease the subsequent species sensitive screening testing and the most sensitive species will remain unchanged.

G. Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TRE)

1. **TRE Implementation.** The Discharger is required to initiate a TRE when there is any combination of two or more chronic toxicity MDEL or MMEL violations within a single calendar month or within two successive calendar months has occurred. In addition, if other information indicates toxicity (e.g., results of additional monitoring, results of monitoring at a higher concentration than the IWC, fish kills, intermittent recurring toxicity), the Central Valley Water Board may require a TRE. A TRE may also be required when there is no effluent available to complete a routine monitoring test or MMEL compliance test.

- a. **Preparation and Implementation of Detailed TRE Action Plan.** The Discharger shall conduct TREs in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan. Within 30 days of the test result that triggered the TRE, the Discharger shall submit to the Executive Officer a TRE Action Plan. The TRE Action Plan shall include the following information, and comply with additional conditions set by the Executive Officer:
 - i. Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including a TRE WET monitoring schedule;
 - ii. Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
 - iii. A schedule for these actions, progress reports, and the final report.
 - b. The Central Valley Water Board recognizes that toxicity may be episodic and identification of causes and reduction of sources of toxicity may not be successful in all cases. The TRE may be ended at any stage if monitoring finds there is no longer toxicity.
2. **TRE Work Plan.** The Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board a TRE Work Plan for approval by the Executive Officer by the due date in the Technical Reports Table E-7. If the Executive Officer does not disapprove the work plan within 60 days, the work plan shall become effective. 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 of adequate detail to allow the Discharger to immediately initiate a TRE and shall be developed in accordance with U.S. EPA guidance as discussed below.
- a. Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants, EPA/833-B-99/002, August 1999.
 - b. Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs), EPA/600/2-88/070, April 1989.
 - c. Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures, Second Edition, EPA 600/6-91/003, February 1991.
 - d. Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I, EPA/600/6-91/005F, May 1992.
 - e. 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.

- f. 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.
- g. 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.
- h. 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.
- i. Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991.

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VII. RECYCLING MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 and RSW-002

- 1. The Discharger shall monitor Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek at RSW-001 in accordance with Table E-4 and the testing requirements described in section VIII.A.2 below:

Table E-4. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Week
Temperature	°F	Grab	1/Week
Turbidity	NTUs	Grab	1/Week
pH	Standard Units	Grab	1/Week
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/Month
Electrical Conductivity	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Month
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter
Hardness	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	µg/L	Grab	(see Section IX.)

- 2. **Table E-4 Testing Requirements.** The Discharger shall comply with the following testing requirements when monitoring for the parameters described in Table E-4:

- a. **Applicable to all parameters.** Parameters shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board. In addition, if requested by the Discharger, the sample type may be modified by the Executive Officer to another 40 CFR part 136 allowed sample type.
 - b. **Handheld Field Meter.** A handheld field meter may be used for **temperature** and **pH**, provided the meter utilizes a U.S. EPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.
 - c. **Hardness** samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.
 - d. **Aluminum.** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for aluminum can be demonstrated using either total or acid-soluble (inductively coupled plasma/atomic emission spectrometry or inductively coupled plasma/mass spectrometry) analysis methods, as supported by U.S. EPA's Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Aluminum document (EPA 440/5-86-008), or other standard methods that exclude aluminum silicate particles as approved by the Executive Officer.
 - e. **Priority Pollutants.** For all priority pollutant constituents listed in Table E-5 (Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Pesticides and Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern) the RL shall be consistent with sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP) and the SSM Rule specified under 40 C.F.R. sections 122.21(e)(3) and 122.44(i)(1)(iv).
 - f. **Aluminum and dichlorobromomethane** are only required at RSW-001.
3. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by RSW-001 or and RSW-002 when discharging to the Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek. Attention shall be given to the presence of:
- a. Floating or suspended matter;
 - b. Discoloration;
 - c. Bottom deposits;
 - d. Aquatic life;
 - e. Visible films, sheens, or coatings;

- f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths; and
- g. Potential nuisance conditions.

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

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Solids Monitoring – Not Applicable

B. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization

1. Monitoring Frequency

- a. **Effluent Sampling.** Samples shall be collected from the effluent (Monitoring Location EFF-001) quarterly between 1 April 2026 and 31 March 2027.
- b. **Receiving Water Sampling.** Samples shall be collected from the upstream receiving water (Monitoring Location RSW-001) quarterly between 1 April 2026 and 31 March 2027.

2. **Analytical Methods.** Constituents shall be collected and analyzed consistent with the Discharger's Analytical Methods Report (MRP, X.D.2) using sufficiently sensitive analytical methods and Reporting Levels (RLs) per the SSM Rule specified in 40 C.F.R. 122.21(e)(3) and 122.44(i)(1)(iv). The "Reporting Level" is synonymous with the "Method Minimum Level" described in the SSM Rule. The results of the monitoring shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the quarterly self-monitoring reports. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.

3. **Analytical Methods Report Certification.** Prior to beginning the Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization monitoring, the Discharger shall provide a certification acknowledging the scheduled start date of the Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization monitoring and confirming that samples will be collected and analyzed as described in the previously submitted Analytical Methods Report. If there are changes to the previously submitted Analytical Methods Report, the Discharger shall outline those changes. A one-page certification form will be provided by Central Valley Water Board staff with the permit's Notice of Adoption that the Discharger can use to satisfy this requirement. The certification form shall be submitted electronically via CIWQS submittal by the due date in the Technical Reports Table E-7.

4. The Discharger shall conduct effluent and receiving water characterization monitoring in accordance with Table E-5 and the testing requirements described in section IX.E-5 below.

Table E-5. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring

VOLATILE ORGANICS

CTR Number	Volatile Organic Parameters	CAS Number	Units	Effluent Sample Type
25	2-Chloroethyl vinyl Ether	110-75-8	µg/L	Grab
17	Acrolein	107-02-8	µg/L	Grab
18	Acrylonitrile	107-13-1	µg/L	Grab
19	Benzene	71-43-2	µg/L	Grab
20	Bromoform	75-25-2	µg/L	Grab
21	Carbon Tetrachloride	56-23-5	µg/L	Grab
22	Chlorobenzene	108-90-7	µg/L	Grab
24	Chloroethane	75-00-3	µg/L	Grab
26	Chloroform	67-66-3	µg/L	Grab
35	Methyl Chloride	74-87-3	µg/L	Grab
23	Dibromochloromethane	124-48-1	µg/L	Grab
27	Dichlorobromomethane	75-27-4	µg/L	Grab
36	Methylene Chloride	75-09-2	µg/L	Grab
33	Ethylbenzene	100-41-4	µg/L	Grab
89	Hexachlorobutadiene	87-68-3	µg/L	Grab
34	Methyl Bromide (Bromomethane)	74-83-9	µg/L	Grab
94	Naphthalene	91-20-3	µg/L	Grab
38	Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)	127-18-4	µg/L	Grab
39	Toluene	108-88-3	µg/L	Grab
40	trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	156-60-5	µg/L	Grab
43	Trichloroethylene (TCE)	79-01-6	µg/L	Grab
44	Vinyl Chloride	75-01-4	µg/L	Grab
21	Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	1634-04-4	µg/L	Grab
41	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71-55-6	µg/L	Grab
42	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	79-00-5	µg/L	Grab
28	1,1-Dichloroethane	75-34-3	µg/L	Grab
30	1,1-Dichloroethylene (DCE)	75-35-4	µg/L	Grab
31	1,2-Dichloropropane	78-87-5	µg/L	Grab
32	1,3-Dichloropropylene	542-75-6	µg/L	Grab
37	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	79-34-5	µg/L	Grab
101	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120-82-1	µg/L	Grab
29	1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2	µg/L	Grab
75	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	95-50-1	µg/L	Grab
76	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	541-73-1	µg/L	Grab
77	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	106-46-7	µg/L	Grab

SEMI-VOLATILE ORGANICS

CTR Number	Semi-Organic Volatile Parameters	CAS Number	Units	Effluent Sample Type
60	Benzo(a)Anthracene	56-55-3	µg/L	Grab
85	1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	122-66-7	µg/L	Grab
45	2-Chlorophenol	95-57-8	µg/L	Grab
46	2,4-Dichlorophenol	120-83-2	µg/L	Grab
47	2,4-Dimethylphenol	105-67-9	µg/L	Grab
49	2,4-Dinitrophenol	51-28-5	µg/L	Grab
82	2,4-Dinitrotoluene	121-14-2	µg/L	Grab
55	2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	88-06-2	µg/L	Grab
83	2,6-Dinitrotoluene	606-20-2	µg/L	Grab
50	2-Nitrophenol	88-75-5	µg/L	Grab
71	2-Chloronaphthalene	91-58-7	µg/L	Grab
78	3,3-Dichlorobenzidine	91-94-1	µg/L	Grab
62	Benzo(b)Fluoranthene	205-99-2	µg/L	Grab
52	4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	59-50-7	µg/L	Grab
48	2-Methyl-4,6-Dinitrophenol	534-52-1	µg/L	Grab
51	4-Nitrophenol	100-02-7	µg/L	Grab
69	4-Bromophenyl Phenyl Ether	101-55-3	µg/L	Grab
72	4-Chlorophenyl Phenyl Ether	7005-72-3	µg/L	Grab
56	Acenaphthene	83-32-9	µg/L	Grab
57	Acenaphthylene	208-96-8	µg/L	Grab
58	Anthracene	120-12-7	µg/L	Grab
59	Benzidine	92-87-5	µg/L	Grab
61	Benzo(a)Pyrene	50-32-8	µg/L	Grab
63	Benzo(ghi)Perylene	191-24-2	µg/L	Grab
64	Benzo(k)Fluoranthene	207-08-9	µg/L	Grab
65	Bis (2-Chloroethoxy) Methane	111-91-1	µg/L	Grab
66	Bis (2-Chloroethyl) Ether	111-44-4	µg/L	Grab
67	Bis (2-Chloroisopropyl) Ether	108-60-1	µg/L	Grab
68	Bis(2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	117-81-7	µg/L	Grab
70	Butylbenzyl Phthalate	85-68-7	µg/L	Grab
73	Chrysene	218-01-9	µg/L	Grab
81	Di-n-butyl Phthalate	84-74-2	µg/L	Grab
84	Di-n-Octyl Phthalate	117-84-0	µg/L	Grab
74	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	53-70-3	µg/L	Grab
79	Diethyl Phthalate	84-66-2	µg/L	Grab
80	Dimethyl Phthalate	131-11-3	µg/L	Grab
86	Fluoranthene	206-44-0	µg/L	Grab
87	Fluorene	86-73-7	µg/L	Grab
88	Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1	µg/L	Grab
90	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	77-47-4	µg/L	Grab
91	Hexachloroethane	67-72-1	µg/L	Grab

CTR Number	Semi-Organic Volatile Parameters	CAS Number	Units	Effluent Sample Type
92	Indeno(1,2,3-cd) Pyrene	193-39-5	µg/L	Grab
93	Isophorone	78-59-1	µg/L	Grab
98	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	86-30-6	µg/L	Grab
96	N-Nitrosodimethylamine	62-75-9	µg/L	Grab
97	N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	621-64-7	µg/L	Grab
95	Nitrobenzene	98-95-3	µg/L	Grab
53	Pentachlorophenol (PCP)	87-86-5	µg/L	Grab
99	Phenanthrene	85-01-8	µg/L	Grab
54	Phenol	108-95-2	µg/L	Grab
100	Pyrene	129-00-0	µg/L	Grab

INORGANICS

CTR Number	Inorganic Parameters	CAS Number	Units	Effluent Sample Type
1	Antimony, Total	7440-36-0	µg/L	24-hour Composite
2	Arsenic, Total	7440-38-2	µg/L	24-hour Composite
15	Asbestos	1332-21-4	µg/L	24-hour Composite
3	Beryllium, Total	7440-41-7	µg/L	24-hour Composite
4	Cadmium, Total	7440-43-9	µg/L	24-hour Composite
5	Chromium, Total	7440-47-3	µg/L	24-hour Composite
6	Copper, Total	7440-50-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
NL	Iron, Total	7439-89-6	µg/L	24-hour Composite
7	Lead, Total	7439-92-1	µg/L	24-hour Composite
NL	Manganese, Total	7439-96-5	µg/L	24-hour Composite
8	Mercury, Total	7439-97-6	µg/L	Grab
9	Nickel, Total	7440-02-0	µg/L	24-hour Composite
10	Selenium, Total	7782-49-2	µg/L	24-hour Composite
11	Silver, Total	7440-22-4	µg/L	24-hour Composite
12	Thallium, Total	7440-28-0	µg/L	24-hour Composite
13	Zinc, Total	7440-66-6	µg/L	24-hour Composite

NON-METALS/MINERALS

CTR Number	Non-Metal/Mineral Parameters	CAS Number	Units	Effluent Sample Type
NL	Boron	7440-42-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
NL	Chloride	16887-00-6	mg/L	24-hour Composite
14	Cyanide, Total (as CN)	57-12-5	µg/L	Grab
NL	Sulfate	14808-79-8	mg/L	24-hour Composite
NL	Sulfide (as S)	5651-88-7	mg/L	24-hour Composite

PESTICIDES/PCBs/DIOXINS

CTR Number	Pesticide/PCB/Dioxin Parameters	CAS Number	Units	Effluent Sample Type
110	4,4-DDD	72-54-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
109	4,4-DDE	72-55-9	µg/L	24-hour Composite
108	4,4-DDT	50-29-3	µg/L	24-hour Composite
112	alpha-Endosulfan	959-98-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
103	alpha-BHC (Benzene hexachloride)	319-84-6	µg/L	24-hour Composite
102	Aldrin	309-00-2	µg/L	24-hour Composite
113	beta-Endosulfan	33213-65-9	µg/L	24-hour Composite
104	beta-BHC (Benzene hexachloride)	319-85-7	µg/L	24-hour Composite
107	Chlordane	57-74-9	µg/L	24-hour Composite
106	delta-BHC (Benzene hexachloride)	319-86-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
111	Dieldrin	60-57-1	µg/L	24-hour Composite
114	Endosulfan Sulfate	1031-07-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
115	Endrin	72-20-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
116	Endrin Aldehyde	7421-93-4	µg/L	24-hour Composite
117	Heptachlor	76-44-8	µg/L	24-hour Composite
118	Heptachlor Epoxide	1024-57-3	µg/L	24-hour Composite
105	gamma-BHC (Benzene hexachloride or Lindane)	58-89-9	µg/L	24-hour Composite
119	Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) 1016	12674-11-2	µg/L	24-hour Composite
120	PCB 1221	11104-28-2	µg/L	24-hour Composite
121	PCB 1232	11141-16-5	µg/L	24-hour Composite
122	PCB 1242	53469-21-9	µg/L	24-hour Composite
123	PCB 1248	12672-29-6	µg/L	24-hour Composite
124	PCB 1254	11097-69-1	µg/L	24-hour Composite
125	PCB 1260	11096-82-5	µg/L	24-hour Composite
126	Toxaphene	8001-35-2	µg/L	24-hour Composite
16	2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	1746-01-6	mg/L	24-hour Composite

5. **Table E-5 Testing Requirements.** The Discharger shall comply with the following testing requirements when monitoring for the parameters described in Table E-5:
 - a. **Applicable to All Parameters.** Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.
 - b. **Grab Samples.** A grab sample is defined as an individual discrete sample collected over a period of time not exceeding 15 minutes. It can be taken manually, using a pump, scoop, vacuum, or other suitable device.
 - c. **24-hour Composite Samples.** All 24-hour composite samples shall be collected from a 24-hour flow proportional composite.

- d. **Redundant Sampling.** The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent monitoring for constituents that have already been sampled in a given month, as required in Table E-3, with the exception of hardness which shall be sampled concurrently with the hardness-dependent metals (cadmium, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc).
- e. **Concurrent Sampling.** Effluent and receiving water sampling shall be performed at approximately the same time, on the same date.
- f. **Sample Type.** All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples. Effluent samples shall be taken as described in Table E-5.
- g. **Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate.** In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.
- h. **Total Mercury and Methyl Mercury.** Unfiltered methyl mercury and total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2). The analysis of methyl mercury and total mercury shall be by U.S. EPA method 1630 and 1631 (Revision E), respectively, with a reporting limit of 0.05 ng/L for methyl mercury and 0.5 ng/L for total mercury.
- i. **Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon** shall be sampled using U.S. EPA Method 625M, Method 8141, or equivalent GC/MS method with a lower Reporting Limit than the Basin Plan Water Quality Objectives of 0.015 µg/L and 0.1 µg/L for chlorpyrifos and diazinon, respectively.
- j. **Iron and Manganese.** Prior to analysis, samples shall be filtered through a 1.5-micron filter.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.
2. Upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a summary monitoring report. The report shall contain both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year(s).
3. **Compliance Time Schedules.** For compliance time schedules included in the Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board, on or

before each compliance due date, the specified document or a written report detailing compliance or 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 Central Valley Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.

4. The Discharger shall report to the Central Valley Water Board any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission within 15 days of reporting the data to the Commission pursuant to section 313 of the "Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act" of 1986.

B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

1. The Discharger shall [electronically submit SMRs](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/) using the State Water Board’s California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program website (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ciwqs/). The CIWQS website will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.
2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit monthly, quarterly, semiannual, and annual SMRs including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMRs are to include all new monitoring results obtained since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR. Monthly SMRs are required even if there is no discharge. If no discharge occurs during the month, the monitoring report must be submitted stating that there has been no discharge.
3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

Table E-6. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Hour	Permit effective date	Hourly	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Day	Permit effective date	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	Submit with monthly SMR

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
1/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Month	Permit effective date	1st day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
1/Quarter	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 March 1 April through 30 June 1 July through 30 September 1 October through 31 December	1 May 1 August 1 November 1 February of following year
2/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 30 June 1 July through 31 December	1 August 1 February of following year
1/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 December	1 February of following year

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

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

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

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

- c. Sample results less than the laboratory’s MDL shall be reported as “Not Detected,” or ND.

- d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the Minimum Level (ML) value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
5. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an AMEL and 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.
6. **The Discharger shall submit SMRs** in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.
 - b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the waste discharge requirements; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.

- c. The Discharger shall attach all final laboratory reports from all contracted commercial laboratories, including quality assurance/quality control information, with all its SMRs for which sample analyses were performed.
7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMRs calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:
 - a. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall report monthly in the self-monitoring report the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the receiving water (RSW-001 and RSW-002).
 - b. **Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the turbidity increase in the receiving water applicable to the natural turbidity condition specified in section V.A.17.a-e. of the Waste Discharge Requirements.
 - c. **Temperature Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the temperature increase in the receiving water based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.

C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs)

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

D. Other Reports

1. **Analytical Methods Report.** The Discharger shall complete and submit an Analytical Methods Report, electronically via CIWQS submittal, by the due date shown in the Technical Reports Table E-7. The Analytical Methods Report shall include the following for each constituent to be monitored in accordance with this Order: 1) applicable water quality objective, 2) reporting level (RL), 3) method detection limit (MDL), and 4) analytical method. The analytical methods shall be sufficiently sensitive with RLs consistent with the SSM Rule per 40 C.F.R. 122.21(e)(3) and 122.44(i)(1)(iv), and with the Minimum Levels (MLs) in the SIP, Appendix 4. The "Reporting Level or RL" is synonymous with the "Method Minimum Level" described in the SSM Rule. If an RL is not less than or equal to the applicable water quality objective for a constituent, the Discharger shall explain how the proposed analytical method complies with the SSM Rule as outlined above in Attachment E, section I.F. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide a tool with the permit's Notice of Adoption to assist the Discharger in completing this requirement. The tool will include the constituents

and associated applicable water quality objectives to be included in the Analytical Methods Report.

2. **Annual Operations Report.** The Discharger shall submit a written report to the Central Valley Water Board, electronically via CIWQS submittal, containing the following by the due date in the Technical Reports Table E-7:
 - 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. The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the Central Valley Water Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing. The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the waste discharge requirements.
3. **Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).** For the 5-year permit renewal, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Central Valley Water Board, electronically via CIWQS submittal, containing, at minimum, the following by the due date in the Technical Reports Table E-7:
 - a. Report of Waste Discharge (Form 200);
 - b. NPDES Form 1;
 - c. NPDES Form 2C;
 - d. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP).** The Discharger shall evaluate the effectiveness of the SEMP and provide a summary with the Report of Waste Discharge.
4. **Technical Report Submittals.** This Order includes requirements to submit a ROWD, special study technical reports, progress reports, and other reports identified in the MRP (hereafter referred to collectively as “technical reports”).

The Technical Reports Table E-7 and subsequent table notes below summarize all technical reports required by this Order and the due dates for submittal. All technical reports shall be submitted electronically via CIWQS submittal. Technical reports should be uploaded as a PDF, Microsoft Word, or Microsoft Excel file attachment.

Table E-7. Technical Reports

Report #	Technical Report	Due Date	CIWQS Report Name
	Standard Reporting Requirements		
1	Report of Waste Discharge	31 March 2029	ROWD
2	Analytical Methods Report	31 May 2025	MRP X.D.1
3	Analytical Methods Report Certification	1 January 2026	MRP IX.B.3.
4	Annual Operations Report	1 February 2026	MRP X.D.2
5	Annual Operations Report	1 February 2027	MRP X.D.2
6	Annual Operations Report	1 February 2028	MRP X.D.2
7	Annual Operations Report	1 February 2029	MRP X.D.2
8	Annual Operations Report	1 February 2030	MRP X.D.2
9	Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Workplan	30 June 2025	WDR VI.C.2.a.i
10	Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan	31 March 2029	WDR VI.C.3.d
11	Solids Management Plan	31 October 2025	WDR VI.C.6.b

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Table of Contents

I.	Permit Information	F-3
II.	Facility Description	F-4
	A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls	F-4
	B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters.....	F-5
	C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data	F-5
	D. Compliance Summary.....	F-5
	E. Planned Changes	F-6
III.	Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations.....	F-6
	A. Legal Authorities	F-6
	B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)	F-6
	C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans	F-6
	D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List	F-9
	E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations.....	F-10
IV.	Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-11
	A. Discharge Prohibitions	F-11
	B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-12
	1. Scope and Authority.....	F-12
	2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations	F-13
	C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs).....	F-14
	1. Scope and Authority.....	F-14
	2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives	F-15
	3. Determining the Need for WQBELs	F-25
	4. WQBEL Calculations	F-37
	5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)	F-39
	D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations.....	F-41
	1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations	F-41
	2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations	F-42
	3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.....	F-42
	4. Antidegradation Policies	F-43
	5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.....	F-45
	E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable.....	F-47
	F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-47
	G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable	F-47
V.	Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations	F-47
	A. Surface Water	F-47
	B. Groundwater	F-48
VI.	Rationale for Provisions.....	F-48
	A. Standard Provisions.....	F-48
	B. Special Provisions.....	F-49
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	F-49
	2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-50
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention	F-50

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications.....	F-50
5. Special Provisions for POTWs – Not Applicable.....	F-52
6. Other Special Provisions.....	F-52
7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable.....	F-52
VII. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	F-52
A. Influent Monitoring.....	F-53
B. Effluent Monitoring.....	F-53
C. Receiving Water Monitoring.....	F-53
1. Surface Water.....	F-53
2. Groundwater – Not Applicable.....	F-53
D. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements.....	F-53
E. Other Monitoring Requirements.....	F-55
VIII. Public Participation.....	F-56
A. Notification of Interested Persons.....	F-56
B. Written Comments.....	F-56
C. Public Hearing.....	F-56
D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements.....	F-57
E. Information and Copying.....	F-57
F. Register of Interested Persons.....	F-57
G. Additional Information.....	F-57

Tables

Table F-1 Facility Information.....	F-3
Table F-2 Historic Effluent Limitations.....	F-5
Table F-3 Basin Plan Beneficial Uses.....	F-7
Table F-4 303 (d) List for Butte Creek.....	F-10
Table F-5 TSS Effluent Limitations for General Permits.....	F-13
Table F-6 Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations.....	F-14
Table F-7. Confirmation Sampling Results.....	F-19
Table F-8 Mixing Zones and Dilution Credits.....	F-24
Table F-9 Percent Assimilative Capacity Used Calculations.....	F-24
Table F-10. Summary of Criteria for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals.....	F-25
Table F-11 Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives.....	F-31
Table F-12 Zinc RPA Criteria.....	F-34
Table F-13 Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-38
Table F-14 Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Results – Test of Significant Toxicity at the IWC (100 Percent Effluent).....	F-40
Table F-15 Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Results – Test of Significant Toxicity.....	F-41
Table F-16 Summary of Final Effluent Limitations.....	F-46
Table F-17 Summary of Monitoring Changes.....	F-53

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

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

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

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the Facility.

Table F-1 Facility Information

Waste Discharge ID:	5A04012001
CIWQS Facility Place ID:	247544
Discharger:	Paradise Irrigation District
Name of Facility:	Paradise Water Treatment Plant, Magalia
Facility Address:	13888 Pine Needle Drive
Facility City, State Zip:	Magalia, CA 95954
Facility County:	Butte
Facility Contact, Title and Phone Number:	Rebekah Taylor, Water Treatment Plant Superintendent, (530) 876-2067
Mailing Address:	P.O. Box 2409 Paradise, CA 95967
Billing Address:	SAME
Type of Facility:	Drinking Water Treatment Plant
Major or Minor Facility:	Minor
Threat to Water Quality:	3
Complexity:	B
Pretreatment Program:	N/A
Recycling Requirements:	N/A
Facility Permitted Flow (Average):	0.6 million gallons per day (MGD)
Facility Design Flow:	2.0 MGD
Watershed:	Upper Butte Creek Hydrologic Unit (521.30)
Receiving Water:	Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek
Receiving Water Type:	Inland surface water

- A.** Paradise Irrigation District (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of Paradise Water Treatment Plant (hereinafter Facility), a drinking water treatment plant.

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 drinking water treatment wastewater to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek, a water of the United States, tributary to Butte Creek within Upper Butte Creek hydrologic unit (521.30). The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2020-0016 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0083488 adopted on 16 April 2020 and expires on 31 May 2025. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.
- C.** The Discharger filed a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its waste discharge requirements (WDRs) and NPDES permit on 4 June 2024. Supplemental information was requested on 21 June 2024 and received on 21 June 2024. The application was deemed complete on 1 July 2024.
- D.** Regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.46 limit the duration of NPDES permits to a fixed term not to exceed five years. Accordingly, Table 3 of this Order limits the duration of the discharge authorization. Under 40 C.F.R. section 122.6(d), States authorized to administer the NPDES program may administratively continue State-issued permits beyond their expiration dates until the effective date of the new permits, if State law allows it. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 23, section 2235.4, the terms and conditions of an expired permit are automatically continued pending reissuance of the permit if the Discharger complies with all federal NPDES requirements for continuation of expired permits.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Paradise Water Treatment Plant (Facility) is owned and operated by the Paradise Irrigation District (Discharger). The Discharger provides treated water from Magalia Reservoir for domestic and agricultural purposes to a population of approximately 9,142.

A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

The Facility discharges wastewater from their backwash ponds to the Magalia Reservoir. Wastewater from the Facility consists of clarifier wash water, filter backwash water, filter-to-waste waters, waters collected in floor and lab drains and waters collected in drain from containment areas. Wastewaters are routed to a wash water equalization tank and then pumped approximately one quarter mile to two backwash ponds prior to discharge to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek, a water of the United States, and tributary to Butte Creek within the Butte Creek watershed.

The Facility has a discharge design flow of 2.0 mgd and is permitted to discharge year-round.

The Facility generates approximately 40 tons of solids that are transported annually to a Class III landfill.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in section 25, T25N, R3E, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.
2. Drinking water treatment filter backwash is discharged at Discharge Point 001 to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek, a water of the United States and a tributary to Butte Creek at a point latitude 39° 48' 59.5" N and longitude 121° 34' 55.7" W.

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

Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2020-0016 for discharges from Discharge Point No. 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001 and EFF-002) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2020-0016 are as follows:

Table F-2 Historic Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Historic Effluent Limitations	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Dichlorobromo methane	µg/L	AMEL 3.3 MDEL 5.2	3.7	3.7
pH	S.U.	Instantaneous Max 8.5 Instantaneous Min 6.5	--	6.6-8.6
Settleable Solids	mL/L	AMEL 0.1 MDEL 0.2	ND	ND
Suspended Solids, Total	mg/L	AMEL 30 MDEL 50	18	33
Suspended Solids, Total	lb/day	AMEL 150 MDEL 250	58	107
Residual Chlorine, Total	mg/L	1-hour average: 0.019 4-day average: 0.011	--	ND ND

D. Compliance Summary

During the previous permit term, the Discharger was subject to the following enforcement actions:

- Administrative Civil Liability R5-2023-0530 was issued for violations occurring between 5 November 2019 and 30 November 2019. The

Discharger was fined \$6,000 in mandatory minimum penalties (MMPs) for total recoverable aluminum effluent limit violations. The Discharger waived their right to a hearing and paid the amount in full.

- A Notice of Violation was issued on 20 October 2022 for violations occurring between 3 July 2019 and 15 April 2020. The Discharger was assessed \$6,000 in MMPs for violations of total aluminum effluent limitations.
- A Notice of Violation was issued on 16 December 2022 for violations that occurred on 22 August 2022. The Discharger was assessed \$0 in MMPs for violations of discharge prohibitions III.A and III.B of Order R5-2020-0016.

The compliance issues discussed above have been resolved and are not ongoing; there are no associated issues remaining at the Facility.

E. Planned Changes

There are no planned changes for the Facility during the term of this Order.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

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

A. Legal Authorities

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

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of CEQA, (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code. Additionally, the adoption of land discharge requirements for the Facility constitutes permitting of an existing facility that is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to CCR, title 14, section 15301.

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

1. **Water Quality Control Plans.** Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans.

- a. Basin Plan. The Central Valley Water Board adopted a Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins, Fifth Edition, Revised February 2019 (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan.

The Basin Plan at section 2.1 states that the beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. The Basin Plan in Table 2-1, section 2, does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek, but does identify present and potential uses for Butte Creek, to which Magalia Reservoir, via Little Butte Creek, is tributary. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Thus, beneficial uses applicable to Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek are as follows:

Table F-3 Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek	Existing: Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (ARG); hydropower generation (POW); water contact recreation (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); migration of aquatic organisms, warm and cold (MIGR); spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, warm and cold (SPWN); and wildlife habitat (WILD).

- b. **Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California.** The Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (ISWEBE Plan) was adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) on 1 December 2020, under authority provided by Water Code sections 13140 and 13170. Except as otherwise indicated, this ISWEBE Plan establishes provisions for water quality and sediment quality that apply to all inland surface waters, enclosed bays, and estuaries and coastal lagoons of the state, including both waters of the United States and surface waters of the state. The State Water Board

rescinded the ISWEBE Plan on 5 October 2021 in Resolution No. 2021- 0044. The portions of the ISWEBE Plan, including the Toxicity Provisions, remain in effect as state policy for water quality control.

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

limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.

6. **Domestic Water Quality.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.
7. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, 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.
8. **Storm Water Requirements.** U.S. EPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 C.F.R. parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from certain industrial facilities. Drinking water treatment facilities are not required to enroll in the Industrial Storm Water General Order. The Discharger has stated that they employ best management practices to avoid stormwater contact with industrial pollutants; storm water from the site discharges to Little Butte Creek.

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

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 CWA, states, territories, and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. 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 11 May 2022 U.S. EPA gave final approval to California's 2020 – 2022 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 C.F.R. part 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 Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek is not listed as an impaired water body on the 2020-2024 303(d) list. However, the Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte

Creek is tributary to Butte Creek and Butte Creek is listed as impaired for: mercury.

- Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). Table F-4, below, identifies the 303(d) listings and any applicable TMDLs.

Table F-4 303 (d) List for Butte Creek

Pollutant	Potential Sources	TMDL Status
Mercury	Source Unknown	2027

- The 303(d) listings and TMDLs have been considered in the development of the Order.

E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations

- Title 27.** Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations (hereafter Title 27) contains regulatory requirements for the treatment, storage, processing, and disposal of solid waste. Discharges of wastewater to land, including, but not limited to, evaporation ponds or percolation ponds, may be exempt from the requirements of Title 27, CCR, based on section 20090 et seq. The Facility includes drying/settling ponds all of which may be exempt from Title 27 pursuant to section 20090(b), the “wastewater exemption.” The wastewater exemption has the following preconditions for exemption from Title 27:

20090(b) Wastewater – Discharges of wastewater to land, including but not limited to evaporation ponds, percolation ponds, or subsurface leachfields if the following conditions are met:

- (1) the Central Valley Water Board has issued WDRs... or waived such issuance;
- (2) the discharge is in compliance with the applicable water quality control plan; and
- (3) the wastewater does not need to be managed... as a hazardous waste.

There is limited information available to directly determine if constituents present in the settling ponds would be transported to underlying ground water and cause an exceedance of water quality objectives. There are no ground water monitoring wells or domestic wells in the vicinity of the settling ponds.

However, the discharge to the settling ponds consists of discharges from treatment and storage facilities associated with a drinking water treatment plant, is regulated by waste discharge requirements consistent with applicable water quality objectives and does not need to be managed as a hazardous waste. The chemical characteristics of the raw water treated at the water treatment plant is of good quality. No additives other than chlorine, non-ionic polymer, and aluminum are used in the filtration process. All other constituents

that are removed occur naturally in the areas water sources. Therefore, groundwater impacts should be insignificant and should not result in exceedance of water quality objectives. As discussed in Section IV.D.4.b of this Fact Sheet, this Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to groundwater and the discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. **Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.
2. **Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of untreated wastewater, except under the conditions at CFR section 122.41(m)(4)).** As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), define “bypass” as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Water Board’s prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Board adopted a precedential decision, Order No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.
3. **Prohibition III.C (No controllable condition shall create a nuisance).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13050 that requires water quality objectives established for the prevention of nuisance within a specific area. The Basin Plan prohibits conditions that create a nuisance
4. **Prohibition III.D (No discharge of hazardous waste).** This prohibition is based on CCR, title 22, section 66261.1 et seq, that prohibits discharge of hazardous waste.

5. **Prohibition III.E (Average Flow).** This prohibition is based on the design average flow treatment capacity rating for the Facility and ensures the Facility is operated within its treatment capacity.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing U.S. EPA permit regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 125.3.

The CWA requires that technology-based effluent limitations be established based on several levels of controls:

- a. Best practicable treatment control technology (BPT) represents the average of the best existing performance by well-operated facilities within an industrial category or subcategory. BPT standards apply to toxic, conventional, and non-conventional pollutants.
- b. Best available technology economically achievable (BAT) represents the best existing performance of treatment technologies that are economically achievable within an industrial point source category. BAT standards apply to toxic and non-conventional pollutants.
- c. Best conventional pollutant control technology (BCT) represents the control from existing industrial point sources of conventional pollutants including BOD₅, TSS, fecal coliform, pH, and oil and grease. The BCT standard is established after considering a two-part reasonableness test. The first test compares the relationship between the costs of attaining a reduction in effluent discharge and the resulting benefits. The second test examines the cost and level of reduction of pollutants from the discharge from publicly owned treatment works to the cost and level of reduction of such pollutants from a class or category of industrial sources. Effluent limitations must be reasonable under both tests.
- d. New source performance standards (NSPS) represent the best available demonstrated control technology standards. The intent of NSPS guidelines is to set limitations that represent state-of-the-art treatment technology for new sources.

The CWA requires U.S. EPA to develop effluent limitations, guidelines and standards (ELGs) representing application of BPT, BAT, BCT, and

NSPS. Section 402(a)(1) of the CWA and 40 C.F.R. section 125.3 authorize the use of best professional judgment (BPJ) to derive technology-based effluent limitations on a case-by-case basis where ELGs are not available for certain industrial categories and/or pollutants of concern. Where BPJ is used, the Central Valley Water Board must consider specific factors outlined in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

- a. **Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and Settleable Solids.** For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states, “[w]ater shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.” Order No. R5-2020-0016 established effluent limitations for settleable solids which are technology-based effluent limitations (TBELs) for water treatment plants based on BPJ. This Order carries over the settleable solid TBELs established by Order No. R5-2020-0016. These effluent limitations reflect removal efficiencies for properly designed, constructed, and operated water treatment systems. Because the amount of settleable solids is measured in terms of volume per volume without a mass component, it is impracticable to calculate mass limitations for inclusion in this Order.

The Basin Plan includes water quality objectives that receiving waters not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. This Order contains average monthly and maximum daily effluent limits for TSS of 30 and 50 mg/L, respectively. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that TSS are more likely to be resuspended than settleable solids in the wastewater settling ponds before discharge, and therefore, TSS concentrations are more likely to vary in the discharge than concentrations of settleable solids. To establish effluent limits for TSS, the Central Valley Water Board has examined several general permits, which regulate wastewater discharges from water treatment plants. A summary of these TSS limitations is presented in the table, below.

Table F-5 TSS Effluent Limitations for General Permits

State	Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily
Arkansas	20	No Limit	30
California (Regional Water Board 2)	30	45	No Limit
Massachusetts	30	No Limit	50
New Hampshire	20	No Limit	50
South Carolina	30	No Limit	60
West Virginia	30	No Limit	60

The Central Valley Water Board has also relied on research performed for the USEPA in 1987 (SAIC, Model Permit Package for the Water Supply Industry, EPA Contract No. 68-01-7043). This study found that 76 percent of water treatment plants surveyed used sedimentation lagoons for wastewater treatment. In these facilities, limitations of 30 mg/L and 45 mg/L were representative of the, then, current permitting practice for average monthly and maximum daily TSS limitations, respectively. Analysis of actual monitoring data from these facilities showed the 95th percent occurrence (monthly average) and 99th percent occurrence (maximum daily) levels of treatment to be 3.38 mg/L and 6.0 mg/L, respectively. The study recommended limitations of 30 mg/L and 45 mg/L as the monthly average and daily maximum TSS limitations for a model NPDES permit. Using BPJ pursuant to Section 402 (a)(1)(b) of the CWA, the Central Valley Water Board is establishing average monthly and maximum daily TBELs for TSS of 30 and 50 mg/L, respectively.

**Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations
 Discharge Point D-001**

Table F-6 Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations
Settleable Solids	mL/L	AMEL 0.1 MDEL 0.2
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	AMEL 30 MDEL 50

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

CWA section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards.

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

as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting the state’s narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

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

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

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 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.

The Basin Plan on page 2-1 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, shellfish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation. 40 C.F.R. section 131.3(e) defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after 28 November 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 C.F.R. section 131.10 requires that uses be obtained by implementing effluent limitations, requires that all downstream uses be protected and states that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a beneficial use for any waters of the United States.

- a. **Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.** Refer to III.C.1. above for a complete description of the receiving water and beneficial uses.

- b. **Effluent and Ambient Background Data.** The reasonable potential analysis (RPA), as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data from May 2021 through June 2024, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMRs, special studies, and the ROWD. Effluent and receiving water zinc data is limited to 10 samples collected between September 2023 and December 2023; prior zinc samples collected by the Discharger were determined to be not applicable to the analysis as a result of a special study conducted by the Discharger in 2023 that demonstrated concentration inconsistencies between their contract laboratories. Results of the study were documented in *Paradise Irrigation District Aluminum and Zinc Special Study Results, 30 January 2024*.
- c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone**
- i. The CWA directs the states to adopt water quality standards to protect the quality of its waters. U.S. EPA's current water quality standards regulation authorizes states to adopt general policies, such as mixing zones, to implement state water quality standards (40 CFR sections 122.44 and 122.45). The U.S. EPA 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 SIP and the Basin Plan. If no procedure applies in the SIP or the Basin Plan, then the Central Valley Water Board may use the U.S. EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control (EPA/505/2-90-001) (TSD).

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

For Priority Pollutants, the SIP supersedes the Basin Plan mixing zone provisions. Section 1.4.2 of the SIP states, in part, "...with the exception of effluent limitations derived from 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 through a water body except within any mixing zone granted by the Regional Board. **The allowance of mixing zones is discretionary and shall be determined on a discharge-by-discharge basis.** The Regional Board may consider allowing mixing zones and dilution credits only for discharges with a physically identifiable point of discharge that is regulated through an NPDES permit issued by the Regional Board." [emphasis added]

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

"A mixing zone shall be as small as practicable. The following conditions must be met in allowing a mixing zone:

A mixing zone shall not:

1. *compromise the integrity of the entire water body;*
2. *cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing thorough 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.”*

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

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

ii. **Magalia Reservoir**

The Magalia Reservoir is formed by an earthen dam that is fed by Little Butte Creek and has an approximate maximum water storage capacity of 800 acre-feet. The Facility primarily pumps source water from the Magalia bypass pipeline upstream of Magalia Reservoir; however, source water is periodically pumped from the Magalia Reservoir intake pipe. The Facility continuously discharges effluent to the Magalia Reservoir. The Magalia Reservoir source intake is approximately 400 feet away, or approximately 150 feet downstream from the Facility’s effluent discharge point.

Flows in the Magalia Reservoir are mostly dependent on dam releases and water intake pumping from the Facility. The Magalia Reservoir is constantly releasing water and always maintains a minimum environmental release of 0.3 MGD. Based on the past three years of data from dam releases and water intake pumping, the approximate harmonic mean flow rate of water flowing out of the Magalia Reservoir is 22.6 MGD.

iii. **Dilution/Mixing Zone Study Results.**

On 27 March 2018, The Discharger submitted a Mixing Zone and Dilution Credit Evaluation (Mixing Zone Study) to the Central Valley Water Board, which provided an analysis of available dilution in the Magalia Reservoir for dichlorobromomethane using the USEPA approved mixing zone model, CORMIX. The following assumptions

were incorporated into the CORMIX model with respect to the Magalia Reservoir: “unbounded” water body, steady state, constant depth, constant temperature, no reactions between constituents, low velocity and receiving water density greater than effluent density. The Mixing Zone Study concluded that the ultimate dilution of the receiving water to effluent was approximately 19:1, and that there was sufficient assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane to allow for a mixing zone and a dilution credit. Additionally, on 14 December 2018, the Discharger submitted the Paradise Irrigation District Dilution Model Verification (Confirmation Sampling) to the Central Valley Water Board, which validated the Mixing Zone Study results. The Confirmation Sampling indicated there was a receiving water to effluent dilution of approximately 58:1 at 60 feet downstream of the effluent outfall. Table F-7 summarizes the results of the Confirmation Sampling for dichlorobromomethane. Figure F-1 shows the sampling locations relative to the discharge point (D-001) and the Magalia Reservoir intake.

Table F-7. Confirmation Sampling Results

Distance from D-001 (ft)	Dichlorobromomethane (µg/L)	Dilution
0	0.6	0
10	0.5	0.2
20	0.2	2.1
60	ND	>58
100	ND	>58
200	ND	>58
400	ND	>58

Table F-7 Notes:

1. If the measured plume concentration was less than background ambient concentration of 0.01 µg/L, for dilution calculations, the plume concentration was set to 0.02 µg/L. Therefore, the max dilution factor was 58.

Figure F-1. Confirmation Sampling Locations in Magalia Reservoir



iv. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Human Health Criteria.** The SIP requires a mixing zone must be as small as practicable and comply with eleven (11) mixing zone prohibitions under section 1.4.2.2.A. Based on Central Valley Water Board staff evaluation, the mixing zone extends up to 60 feet downstream of the Facility’s outfall and a maximum available dilution credit of 58 meets the eleven prohibitions of the SIP as follows:

- (1) Shall not compromise the integrity of the entire water body – The TSD states that, “If the total area affected by elevated concentrations within all mixing zones combined is small compared to the total area of a water body (such as a river segment), then mixing zones are likely to have little effect on the integrity of the water body as a whole, provided that the mixing zone does not impinge on unique or critical habitats.” The

mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. The mixing zone does not compromise the integrity of the entire water body.

- (2) Shall not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone – The mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. Therefore, acutely toxic conditions will not occur in the mixing zone.
- (3) Shall not restrict the passage of aquatic life – The human health mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. Therefore, the mixing zone will not restrict the passage of aquatic life.
- (4) Shall not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or State endangered species laws – The mixing zone is not applicable to aquatic life criteria. The mixing zone will not impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats.
- (5-9) Shall not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life; result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; cause nuisance – The allowance of the mixing zone will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits; or cause nuisance
Therefore, the allowance of the mixing zone will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum; produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity; cause objectionable bottom deposits, or cause nuisance.
- (10) Shall not dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls – The mixing zone is small relative to the water body, so it will not dominate the water body.
Furthermore, the mixing zone does not overlap mixing zones from other outfalls. There are no outfalls or mixing zones in the vicinity of the discharge.
- (11) Shall not be allowed at or near any drinking water intake – The mixing zone is not near a drinking water intake.

A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation is provided in subsection v below to evaluate whether the mixing zones for each pollutant are as small as practicable and comply with the State and federal antidegradation requirements.

v. **Evaluation of Available Dilution for Specific Constituents
(Pollutant-by-Pollutant Evaluation)**

When determining whether to allow dilution credits for a specific pollutant, several factors must be considered, such as, available assimilative capacity, facility performance, and compliance with state and federal antidegradation requirements. The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane and the human health mixing zone meets the mixing zone prohibitions of the SIP section 1.4.2.2.A.

The SIP also requires that “[a] mixing zone shall be as small as practicable” and states in section 1.4.2.2.B that “[t]he RWQCB shall deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to protect beneficial uses, meet the conditions of this Policy, or comply with other regulatory requirements.” The State Anti-Degradation Policy, which incorporates the federal antidegradation policy (State Water Board Order WQ 86-17 [Fay]), requires that existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. Item 2 of the State Anti-Degradation Policy states:

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

The mixing zone allowed in this Order is as small as practicable and will result in the Discharger implementing best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.

A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation is provided below that evaluates facility performance and percent assimilative capacity used for each pollutant.

- (a) **Dichlorobromomethane.** As outlined above, a human health mixing zone extending 60 feet downstream of the Facility’s outfall and a dilution credit of 58 meets the eleven mixing zone prohibitions of section 1.4.2.2.A of the SIP. In this case, however, to ensure the mixing zone is as small as practicable

and considering section 1.4.2.2.B of the SIP, the Central Valley Water Board finds the mixing zone must be limited. The dilution credit for dichlorobromomethane has been adjusted based on Facility performance resulting in a dilution credit of 9 and a mixing zone extending 25 feet downstream has been granted for dichlorobromomethane.

The allowance of a mixing zone and dilution credits are a discretionary act by the Central Valley Water Board. The mixing zone and dilution credit for dichlorobromomethane permitted in this Order will result in a minor increase in the discharge (i.e., use 0.38 percent of the available assimilative capacity in the receiving water). According to U.S. EPA's memorandum on Tier 2 Antidegradation Reviews and Significance Thresholds, any individual decision to lower water quality for nonbioaccumulative chemicals that is limited to 10 percent of the available assimilative capacity represents minimal risk to the receiving water and is fully consistent with the objectives and goals of the Clean Water Act. Per U.S. EPA guidance a simple antidegradation analysis is appropriate in this case. Furthermore, the effluent limits have been limited based on Facility performance which will result in the implementation of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that a pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.

Based on the findings above, this Order grants a mixing zone and dilution credit that has been used for the calculation of WQBELs for dichlorobromomethane. The dimensions of the mixing zones and allowable dilution credits are shown in Table F-8, below. The percent assimilative used was calculated for antidegradation purposes comparing current permitted discharge to the revised permitted discharge with the mixing zone at the long-term receiving water flow of 35 cfs. Use of the long-term receiving water flow is appropriate for antidegradation purposes which considers the long-term effect of an allowed permitted increase in the mass loading on the receiving water. The percent assimilative capacity used calculations are summarized in Table F-9, below.

Table F-8 Mixing Zones and Dilution Credits

Parameter	Mixing Zone Type	Allowed Dilution Credit	Mixing Zone Size (feet)
Dichlorobromomethane	Human Health	9	25L

Table F-9 Percent Assimilative Capacity Used Calculations

Parameter	Dichlorobromomethane
Water Quality Objective/ Criteria	0.56 µg/L
Maximum Background Concentration	0.21 µg/L
Existing Permitted Condition	3.3 µg/L
Revised Permitted Condition	4 µg/L
Existing Permitted Assimilative Capacity	0.63 µg/L
Revised Permitted Assimilative Capacity	0.65 µg/L
Percent Assimilative Capacity Used	0.38%

Table F-9 Notes:

1. Existing Permitted Condition is the existing average monthly effluent limitation or applicable water quality objective/criteria if there is currently no effluent limitation.
 2. Revised Permitted Condition is new average monthly effluent limitation implemented in this Order with the allowed mixing zone(s).
 3. Assimilative Capacity calculated using mas balance equation with a long-term average receiving water flow of 22.6 MGD and permitted effluent average discharge flow of 0.6 MGD.
- e. **Hardness-Dependent CTR Metals Criteria.** The CTR and the NTR contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc. This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the hardness of the receiving water (actual ambient hardness) as required by the SIP and the CTR.

The ambient hardness for the Magalia Reservoir ranges from 29 mg/L to 84 mg/L based on collected ambient data from May 2021 through June 2024. Given the high variability in ambient hardness values, there is no single hardness value that describes the ambient receiving water for all possible scenarios (e.g., minimum, maximum). Because of this variability, staff has determined that based on the ambient hardness concentrations measured in the receiving water, the Central Valley Water Board has discretion to select ambient hardness values within the range of 29 mg/L (minimum) up to 84 mg/L (maximum).

The Central Valley Water Board finds that the use of the ambient hardness values and associated acute and chronic criteria shown in Table F-10 to conduct the reasonable potential analysis (RPA) and, unless otherwise noted in the table, to calculate WQBELs, protect beneficial uses under all ambient receiving water conditions and comply with the SIP, CTR, and Basin Plan.

Table F-10. Summary of Criteria for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals

CTR Metals	Ambient Hardness (mg/L)	Acute Criteria (µg/L, total)	Chronic Criteria (µg/L, total)
Copper	29	4.4	3.2
Chromium III	29	630.1	75.1
Cadmium	29 (acute) 29 (chronic)	1.1	0.9
Lead	29	17	0.66
Nickel	29	165	18
Silver	29	0.5	--
Zinc	29	42	42

Table F-10 Notes:

- 1. Criteria (µg/L total).** Acute and chronic criteria were rounded to two significant figures in accordance with the CTR (40 C.F.R. section 131.38(b)(2)).
- 2. Ambient hardness (mg/L).** Values in Table F-10 represent actual observed receiving water hardness measurements.
- 3. Determining the Need for WQBELs**

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

water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.” Additionally, 40 C.F.R. section 122(d)(1)(vii) requires effluent limits to be developed consistent with any available WLAs developed and approved for the discharge. The process to determine whether a WQBEL is required as described in 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) is referred to as a reasonable potential analysis or RPA. Central Valley Water Board staff conducted RPAs for nearly 200 constituents, including the 126 U.S. EPA priority toxic pollutants. This section includes details of the RPAs for constituents of concern for the Facility. The entire RPA is included in the administrative record and a summary of the constituents of concern is provided in Attachment G.

For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. For non-priority pollutants the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method; therefore, the RPAs have been conducted based on U.S. EPA guidance considering multiple lines of evidence and the site-specific conditions of the discharge.

a. **Constituents with Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).**

40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vii) provides: “When developing water quality-based effluent limits under [section 122.44(d)(1)], the permitting authority shall ensure that: (A) The level of water quality to be achieved by limits on point sources established under this paragraph is derived from, and complies with all applicable water quality standards; and (B) Effluent limits developed to protect a narrative water quality criterion, a numeric water quality criterion, or both, are consistent with the assumptions and requirements of any available WLA for the discharge prepared by the State and approved by U.S. EPA pursuant to [Total Maximum Daily Loads regulations].” U.S. EPA construes 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vii)(B) to mean that “when WLAs are available, they must be used to translate water quality standards into NPDES permit limits.” 54 Fed. Reg. 23868, 23879 (June 2, 1989).

Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek is subject to TMDLs for diazinon and chlorpyrifos and WLAs under those TMDLs are available. The Central Valley Water Board developed WQBELs for these pollutants pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vii), which does not require or contemplate a reasonable potential analysis.

i. **Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos.**

- (a) **WQO.** The Central Valley Water Board completed a TMDL for diazinon and chlorpyrifos for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins and amended the Basin Plan to include diazinon and chlorpyrifos waste load allocations and water quality objectives. The Basin Plan Amendment for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for Control of Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos Discharges was adopted by the

Central Valley Water Board on 28 March 2014 and became effective on 16 August 2017.

The amendment modified Basin Plan Chapter 3 (Water Quality Objectives) to establish site-specific numeric objectives for diazinon and chlorpyrifos for waters with COLD and/or WARM beneficial uses below major dams and identified the requirements to meet the additive formula already in Basin Plan Chapter 4 (Implementation) for the additive toxicity of diazinon and chlorpyrifos.

The amendment states that the waste load allocations for all NPDES-permitted dischargers shall not exceed the sum (S) of one (1) as defined below:

$$S = C_d/WQO_d + C_c/WQO_c \leq 1.0$$

Where:

C_d = diazinon concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$ of point source discharge

C_c = chlorpyrifos concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$ of point source discharge

WQO_d = acute or chronic diazinon water quality objective in $\mu\text{g/L}$

WQO_c = acute or chronic chlorpyrifos water quality objective in $\mu\text{g/L}$

Available samples collected within the applicable averaging period for the water quality objective will be used to determine compliance with the allocations and loading capacity. For purposes of calculating the sum (S) above, analytical results that are reported as 'non-detectable' concentrations are considered to be zero.

The WLAs apply to waterbodies that are downstream of the major dams in Table 3-5 of the Basin Plan, which includes Keswick Dam on the Sacramento River. The Facility discharges to the Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek, which is tributary to Butte Creek, a tributary of the Sacramento River downstream of Keswick Dam.

- (b) **WQBELs.** WQBELs for diazinon and chlorpyrifos are required per the TMDL. This Order includes effluent limits calculated based on the WLAs contained in the TMDL, as follows:

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

$$S(\text{AMEL}) = C_d (\text{M-avg})/0.079 + C_c (\text{M-avg})/0.012 \leq 1.0$$

Where:

$C_d(\text{M-avg})$ = average monthly diazinon effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$

$C_c (\text{M-avg})$ = average monthly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$

Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

$$S(\text{MDEL}) = C_d (\text{W-avg})/0.16 + C_c (\text{W-avg})/0.025 \leq 1.0$$

Where:

$C_d(\text{W-avg})$ = maximum daily diazinon effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$

$C_c (\text{W-avg})$ = maximum daily chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in $\mu\text{g/L}$

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Chlorpyrifos and diazinon were not detected in two effluent sampling events conducted between May 2021 and August 2021. Furthermore, since these pesticides have been banned for public use, they are not expected to be present in the influent to the Facility. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.
- b. **Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** Central Valley Water Board staff conducted reasonable potential analyses for nearly 200 constituents, including the 126 U.S. EPA priority toxic pollutants. All reasonable potential analyses are included in the administrative record and a summary of the constituents of concern is provided in Attachment G. WQBELs are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream excursion of an applicable water quality objective; however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

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

i. **Aluminum**

- (a) **WQO.** The State Water Board Division of Drinking Water (DDW) has established Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) to assist public drinking water systems in managing their drinking water for public welfare considerations, such as taste, color, and odor. The Secondary MCL for aluminum is 200 µg/L for protection of the MUN beneficial use. The Basin Plan requires compliance with Secondary MCLs on an annual average basis.

The 2018 U.S. EPA NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for aluminum recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) and chronic (4-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based upon Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) models for vertebrate and invertebrate species that use pH, dissolved organic carbon (DOC), and total hardness to quantify the effects of these water chemistry parameters on the bioavailability and resultant toxicity of aluminum to aquatic organisms. The U.S. EPA aluminum criteria have been used to implement the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

A CMC of 470 µg/L and CCC of 220 µg/L were calculated considering pH, hardness, and DOC representative of the receiving water and effluent conditions. Effluent and receiving water sampling results for pH, DOC, and hardness from May 2021 to June 2024 were used in the evaluation.

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

U.S. EPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual recommends using a mass-balance approach to determine the

expected critical downstream receiving water concentration using a steady-state approach. The downstream receiving water concentration is then compared to the applicable water quality objectives to determine if the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion. This approach allows assimilative capacity and dilution to be factored into the RPA. This U.S. EPA recommended approach has been used to assess the reasonable potential for nitrate and nitrite in the Facility's effluent to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the applicable water quality objectives. The critical downstream receiving water concentration is calculated using Equation 1, below.

$$C_r = \frac{Q_s C_s + Q_d C_d}{Q_s + Q_d} \text{ (Equation 1)}$$

Where:

Q_s = Critical stream flow

Q_d = Critical effluent flow from discharge flow data
(maximum permitted discharge)

C_s = Critical upstream pollutant concentration

C_d = Critical effluent pollutant concentration

C_r = Critical downstream receiving water pollutant
concentration

Although the Secondary MCL for aluminum is a human health-based criterion, it is designed to be protective of human health for short-term exposure. Therefore, a critical stream flow (Q_s) of 32.7 MGD was used for the RPA for aluminum. The critical effluent flow (Q_d) is 0.6 MGD, which is the maximum permitted flow allowed in this Order. The critical effluent pollutant concentration (C_d) was determined using statistics recommended in the TSD for statistically calculating the projected maximum concentration in the effluent (i.e., Table 3-1 of the TSD using the 99 percent probability basis and 99 percent confidence level).

The maximum observed effluent aluminum concentration was 409 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and the projected maximum effluent aluminum concentration (C_D) is 633 $\mu\text{g/L}$ based on 15 samples collected between May 2021 and June 2024. The maximum observed upstream receiving water concentration (C_s) for aluminum was 163 $\mu\text{g/L}$ based on 15 samples collected between May 2021 and June 2024. Using Equation 1, above, the calculated critical downstream receiving water aluminum concentration (C_r) is 171 $\mu\text{g/L}$. Therefore, the discharge does not have reasonable

potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the applicable water quality objective for aluminum.

ii. **Salinity**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for certain specified water bodies for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. The U.S. EPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no U.S. EPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate. Additionally, there are no U.S. EPA numeric water quality criteria for the protection of agricultural, livestock, and industrial uses. Numeric values for the protection of these uses are typically based on site specific conditions and evaluations to determine the appropriate constituent threshold necessary to interpret the narrative chemical constituent Basin Plan objective. The Central Valley Water Board must determine the applicable numeric limit to implement the narrative objective for the protection of agricultural supply. Table F-11, below, contains various recommended levels for EC or TDS, sulfate, and chloride.

Table F-11 Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives

Parameters	Secondary MCL Recommended Level.	Secondary MCL Upper Level	Secondary MCL Short-term Maximum	U.S. EPA NAWQC	Maximum Calendar Annual Average Effluent Concentration	Maximum Daily Effluent Concentration
EC (µmhos/cm) or TDS (mg/L)	EC 900 or TDS 500	EC 1,600 or TDS 1,000	EC 2,200 or TDS 1,500	N/A	EC 94 TDS 65	EC 118 TDS 68
Sulfate (mg/L)	250	500	600	N/A	5.5	5.6
Chloride (mg/L)	250	500	600	860 1-hour / 230 4-day	4.1	4.2

Table F-11 Notes:

- 1. Agricultural Water Quality Objectives.** Applicable agricultural water quality objectives vary. Procedures for establishing the applicable numeric limitation to implement the

narrative chemical constituent objective can be found in the Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives, section 4.2.2.1.9 of the Basin Plan. However, the Basin Plan does not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. In cases where the natural background concentration of a particular constituent exceeds an applicable water quality objective, the natural background concentration will be considered to comply with the objective.

2. **Secondary MCLs.** Secondary MCLs are for protection of public welfare and are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.
3. **Chloride.** The Secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
4. **Electrical Conductivity or Total Dissolved Solids.** The Secondary MCL for EC is 900 μ mhos/cm as a recommended level, 1600 μ mhos/cm as an upper level, and 2200 μ mhos/cm as a short-term maximum, or when expressed as 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.
5. **Sulfate.** The Secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

(b) **RPA Results.**

- (1) **Chloride.** Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 4 mg/L to 4.2 mg/L, with an average of 4.1 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in the Magalia Reservoir ranged from 1.8 mg/L to 4.2 mg/L, with an average of 3 mg/L, for 2 samples collected by the Discharger from May 2021 through August 2021.
- (2) **Electrical Conductivity or Total Dissolved Solids.** A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows an average effluent EC of 89 μ mhos/cm, with a range from 75 μ mhos/cm to 118 μ mhos/cm. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The background receiving water EC averaged 81 μ mhos/cm. The average TDS effluent concentration was 65 mg/L with concentrations ranging from 62 mg/L to 68 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The background receiving water TDS ranged from 28 mg/L to 55 mg/L, with an average of 41 mg/L.
- (3) **Sulfate.** Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 5.3 mg/L to 5.6 mg/L, with an average of 5.5 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in the Magalia Reservoir ranged from 1.3 mg/L to 1.6 mg/L, with an average of 1.5 mg/L.

(c) **WQBELs.**

As discussed above, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity. On 17 January 2020, certain amendments to the Basin Plan incorporating a Program to Control and Permit Salt Discharges to Surface and Groundwater (Salt Control Program) became effective. Other amendments became effective on 2 November 2020 when approved by the U.S. EPA. The Salt Control Program is a three-phased program, with each phase lasting 10 to 15 years. The Basin Plan requires all salt dischargers to comply with the provisions of the program. Two compliance pathways are available for salt dischargers during Phase 1.

The Phase 1 Compliance pathways are: 1) Conservative Salinity Permitting Approach, which utilizes the existing regulatory structure and focuses on source control, conservative salinity limits on the discharge, and limits the use of assimilative capacity and compliance time schedules; and, 2) Alternative Salinity Permitting Approach, which is an alternative approach to compliance through implementation of specific requirements such as participating in the Salinity Prioritization and Optimization Study (P&O) rather than the application of conservative discharge limits.

The Discharger submitted a Notice of Intent for the Salinity Control Program indicating its intent to meet the Alternative Salinity Permitting Approach. This Order requires implementation of a Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan and participation in the Salinity P&O Study.

iii. Zinc

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. These criteria for zinc are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. Default U.S. EPA translators were used to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The maximum effluent concentration for zinc was 9.8 µg/L, based on 10 samples collected between September 2023 and December 2023. The maximum observed upstream receiving water zinc concentration was 1.7 µg/L, based on 10 samples collected between September 2023 and December 2023. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the

maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness shown in section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet to compare the maximum effluent concentration. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA:

Table F-12 Zinc RPA Criteria

Water Type	CTR Chronic Criterion (Total)	Maximum Concentration (Total)	Criteria Exceeded? (Y/N)
Receiving Water	29 µg/L	1.7 µg/L	No
Effluent	29 µg/L	9.8 µg/L	No

Table F-12 Notes:

1. **Receiving Water.** The CTR Chronic Criterion (Total) for the receiving water is based on lowest observed upstream hardness of 29 mg/L (as CaCO₃).
 2. **Effluent.** The CTR Chronic Criterion (Total) for the effluent is based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness of 29 mg/L (as CaCO₃).
- c. **Constituents with No Data or Insufficient Data. – Not Applicable**
- d. **Constituents with Reasonable Potential.** The Central Valley Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream excursion above a water quality standard for chlorine residual, dichlorobromomethane, pH, and settleable solids. WQBELs for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.
- i. **Chlorine Residual**
 - (a) **WQO.** U.S. EPA developed NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.
 - (b) **RPA Results.** The concentrations of chlorine used in the water treatment system are high enough to harm aquatic life and violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore does exist and effluent limits are required.

The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. The existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream excursion above the NAWQC.

- (c) **WQBELs.** The U.S. EPA's TSD for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-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 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively, based on U.S. EPA's NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.
 - (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of > 0.01 mg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.
- ii. **Dichlorobromomethane**
- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.56 µg/L for dichlorobromomethane for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.
 - (b) **RPA Results.** The maximum effluent concentration (MEC) for dichlorobromomethane was 3.7 µg/L while the maximum observed upstream receiving water concentration was 0.2 µg/L. Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
 - (c) **WQBELs.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane, therefore, a dilution credit of 9 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for dichlorobromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for dichlorobromomethane of 4 µg/L and

7.5 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the MEC of 3.7 mg/L is less than the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iii. **pH**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the "pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5."
- (b) **RPA Results.** The effluent pH ranged from 6.6 to 8.6 while the upstream receiving water pH ranged from 6.6 to 8.6. The pH in the discharge exceeds the Basin Plan water quality objective, therefore the effluent has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream excursion above the objective.
- (c) **WQBELs.** Effluent limitations for pH of 6.5 as an instantaneous minimum and 8.5 as an instantaneous maximum are included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan objectives for pH.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows only one exceedance of the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iv. **Settleable Solids**

- (a) **WQO.** For inland surface waters, the Basin Plan states that "water shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses."
- (b) **RPA Results.** The discharge of filter backwash water has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above the Basin Plan's narrative objective for settleable solids.
- (c) **WQBELs.** The previous permit used 0.1 mL/L as an AMEL and 0.2 mL/L as an MDEL to implement the Basin Plan's narrative objective. These concentrations have proven to be effective in preventing exceedances of the Basin Plan's narrative objective for settleable substances. Therefore, these limits have been retained in this permit. Because the amount of settleable solids

is measured in terms of volume per volume without a mass component, it is impracticable to calculate mass limitations for inclusion in this Order.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Central Valley Water Board anticipates that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. This Order includes WQBELs for chlorine residual, dichlorobromomethane, chlorpyrifos, diazinon, pH, and settleable solids. The general methodology for calculating WQBELs based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.5.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.
- b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from section 1.4 of the SIP:

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

where:

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

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

- c. **Primary and Secondary MCLs.** For non-priority pollutants with primary MCLs to protect human health (e.g., nitrate plus nitrite), the AMEL is set equal to the primary MCL and the MDEL is calculated using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP.

For non-priority pollutants with secondary MCLs that protect public welfare (e.g., taste, odor, and staining), WQBELs were calculated by setting the LTA equal to the secondary MCL and using the AMEL multiplier to set the AMEL. The MDEL was calculated using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP.

- d. **Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** For constituents with acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria, the WQBELs are calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are converted to equivalent long-term averages (i.e. LTA_{acute} and LTA_{chronic}) using statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.
- e. **Human Health Criteria.** For constituents with human health criteria, the WQBELs are calculated in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP. The AMEL is set equal to the ECA and the MDEL is calculated using the MDEL/AMEL multiplier from Table 2 of the SIP.

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

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

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

where:

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

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

Table F-13 Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Average Monthly Effluent Limitations	Average Weekly Effluent Limitations	Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	0.011	0.019	--
Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon	µg/L	See table notes	--	See table notes
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	4	--	7.5
pH	Standard Units	--	--	6.5-8.5
Settleable Solids	ml/L	0.1	0.2	

Table F-13 Notes:

1. **Chlorine, Total Residual** – Average Monthly Effluent Limitation. Applied as a 4- day average effluent limitation.
2. **Chlorine, Total Residual** – Average Weekly Effluent Limitation. Applied as a 1- hour average effluent limitation.
3. **pH – Effluent Limitations.** Applied as a range from instantaneous minimum to instantaneous maximum.
4. Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos – Average Monthly Effluent Limitation.

$$S_{avg} = \frac{C_{D\ avg}}{0.079} + \frac{C_{C\ avg}}{0.012} \leq 1.0$$

5. Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos – Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation.

$$S_{avg} = \frac{C_{D\ max}}{0.16} + \frac{C_{C\ max}}{0.025} \leq 1.0$$

5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

The State Water Board's toxicity provisions, which include numeric objectives for acute and chronic aquatic toxicity, are applicable to this discharge and are hereafter referred to as the Toxicity Provisions.

- a. **Chronic Toxicity.** The chronic aquatic toxicity water quality objective is expressed as a null hypothesis and an alternative hypothesis with a regulatory management decision (RMD) of 0.75, where the following null hypothesis, Ho, shall be used

Ho: Mean response (ambient water) \leq 0.75 • mean response (control)

And where the following alternative hypothesis, Ha, shall be used:

Ha: Mean response (ambient water) $>$ 0.75 • mean response (control)

Attainment of the water quality objective is demonstrated by conducting chronic aquatic toxicity testing and rejecting this null hypothesis in accordance with the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) statistical approach described in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1 and Table A-1 (Chronic Freshwater and East Coast Methods) and Appendix B, Table B-1. When the null hypothesis is rejected, the alternative hypothesis is accepted in its place, and there is no exceedance of the chronic aquatic toxicity water quality objective. Failing to reject the null hypothesis (referred to as a “fail”) is equivalent to an exceedance of the chronic aquatic toxicity water quality objective.

To evaluate compliance with the Statewide Toxicity Provisions aquatic toxicity numeric objectives, acute and chronic whole effluent toxicity testing data has been evaluated in the development of this Order.

The table below is chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger from December 2022.

Table F-14 Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Results – Test of Significant Toxicity at the IWC (100 Percent Effluent)

Date	Fathead Minnow (<i>Pimephales promelas</i>) Survival		Fathead Minnow (<i>Pimephales promelas</i>) Growth		Water Flea (<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>) Survival		Water Flea (<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>) Reproduction		Green Algae (<i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>) Growth	
	Pass/Fail	Percent Effect	Pass/Fail	Percent Effect	Pass/Fail	Percent Effect	Pass/Fail	Percent Effect	Pass/Fail	Percent Effect
12/9/2022	Pass	-5.26	Pass	-8.08	Pass	0.00	Pass	12.3	Pass	-15.19

i. **RPA.** No dilution has been granted for chronic whole effluent toxicity. Therefore, chronic toxicity testing has been conducted at an instream waste concentration (IWC) of 100 percent effluent. A test result that fails the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) or has a percent effect of greater than 10 percent at the IWC demonstrates the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Statewide Toxicity Provisions aquatic toxicity numeric objectives. Based on chronic toxicity testing conducted in December 2022 the percent effect exceeded 10 percent, therefore, the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream exceedance of the Statewide Toxicity Provisions numeric chronic aquatic toxicity objective.

ii. **WQBELs.** The following effluent limitations have been established for chronic whole effluent toxicity:

Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Median Monthly Effluent Limitation (MMEL). No more than one chronic aquatic toxicity test initiated in a toxicity calendar month shall result in a “Fail” at the IWC for any endpoint.

Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL). No chronic aquatic toxicity test shall result in a “Fail” at the Instream Waste Concentration (IWC) for the sub-lethal endpoint measured in the test and a percent effect for that sub-lethal endpoint greater than or equal to 50 percent.

b. **Acute Toxicity.** The acute aquatic toxicity water quality objective is expressed as a null hypothesis and an alternative hypothesis with a

regulatory management decision (RMD) of 0.80, where the following null hypothesis, Ho, shall be used:

Ho: Mean response (ambient water) \leq 0.80 • mean response (control)

And where the following alternative hypothesis, Ha, shall be used:

Ha: Mean response (ambient water) $>$ 0.80 • mean response (control)

Attainment of the water quality objective is demonstrated by conducting acute aquatic toxicity testing and rejecting this null hypothesis in accordance with the TST statistical approach. When the null hypothesis is rejected, the alternative hypothesis is accepted in its place, and there is no exceedance of the acute aquatic toxicity water quality objective. Failing to reject the null hypothesis (referred to as a “fail”) is equivalent to an exceedance of the acute aquatic toxicity water quality objective.

The table below is acute WET testing performed by the Discharger from June 2021 through May 2023.

Table F-15 Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Results – Test of Significant Toxicity

Date	Fathead Minnow (<i>Pimephales promelas</i>) Survival	
	Pass/Fail	Percent Effect
6/2/2021	Pass	0
5/11/2022	Pass	0
5/15/2023	Pass	0

- i. **RPA.** No dilution has been granted for acute whole effluent toxicity. Therefore, acute toxicity testing has been conducted at an instream waste concentration (IWC) of 100 percent effluent. A test result that fails the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) demonstrates the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Statewide Toxicity Provisions aquatic toxicity numeric objectives. Based on acute toxicity testing conducted between June 2021 and May 2023 there were no fails of the TST, therefore, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an instream exceedance of the Statewide Toxicity Provisions aquatic toxicity numeric objectives.

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations

1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations

40 C.F.R section 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(2) allows pollutants that are limited in terms of mass to additionally be limited in terms of

other units of measurement. Pursuant to the exceptions to mass limitations provided in 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1), some effluent limitations are not expressed in terms of mass, such as pH and temperature, and when the applicable standards are expressed in terms of concentration (e.g., CTR criteria and MCLs) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations

40 C.F.R. section 122.45 (d) requires maximum daily and average monthly discharge limitations for all dischargers other than POTWs unless impracticable.

3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

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

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order, with the exception of effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane. The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in Order R5-2020-0016. This relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

- a. **CWA section 402(o)(1) and 303(d)(4).** CWA section 402(o)(1) prohibits the establishment of less stringent water quality-based effluent limits “except in compliance with section 303(d)(4).” CWA section 303(d)(4) has two parts: paragraph (A) which applies to nonattainment waters and paragraph (B) which applies to attainment waters.
 - i. For waters where standards are not attained, CWA section 303(d)(4)(A) specifies that any effluent limit based on a TMDL or other WLA may be revised only if the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limits based on such TMDLs or WLAs will assure the attainment of such water quality standards.
 - ii. For attainment waters, CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) specifies that a limitation based on a water quality standard may be relaxed where the action is consistent with the antidegradation policy.

The Magalia Reservoir/Little Butte Creek is considered an attainment water for dichlorobromomethane because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for this constituent. The exceptions in section 303(d)(4) address both waters in attainment

with water quality standards and those not in attainment, i.e. waters on the section 303(d) impaired waters list. As discussed in section IV.D.4, below, relaxation or removal of the effluent limits complies with federal and state antidegradation requirements. Thus, relaxation of effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane from Order R5-2020-0016 meets the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

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

As described further in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2020-0016 was issued indicates that less stringent effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane based on available dilution credits satisfy requirements in CWA section 402(o)(2). The updated information that supports the relaxation of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

- i. **Dichlorobromomethane.** Based on dilution/mixing zone studies conducted in March 2018 and receiving water monitoring data collected from May 2021 through June 2024, a mixing zone and dilution credit of 9 is applicable and the receiving water contains assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane, as discussed in section IV.C.2.c of this Fact Sheet. Therefore, this Order includes less stringent effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane based on the performance of the Facility and the available dilution.

4. Antidegradation Policies

- a. **Surface Water.** The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Anti-Degradation Policy. This Order provides for an increase in the volume and mass of pollutants discharged. The increase will not have significant impacts on human health, which is the beneficial use most likely affected by the pollutants discharged (dichlorobromomethane). The increase will not cause a violation of water quality objectives. The reduction in water quality will be spatially confined to a mixing zone. Accordingly, a complete antidegradation analysis is not required. Any change in water quality that is expected to occur as a result of the issuance of this order will be consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses. Furthermore,

compliance with these requirements in this order will result in the use of BPTC of the discharge.

This Order relaxes the effluent limitations for dichlorobromomethane based on the allowance of mixing zones in accordance with the Basin Plan, the SIP, U.S. EPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook, 2nd Edition (updated July 2007), and the TSD. As discussed in section IV.C.2.c of this Fact Sheet, the mixing zones are as small as practicable and have been limited as necessary to ensure the effluent limitations result in the implementation of BPTC necessary to assure that a pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.

This Order also removes the mass-based effluent limitation for TSS based on 40 CFR parts 122.45 (d) and (f). The removal of the mass-based effluent limit for TSS will not result in a decrease in the level of treatment or control or a reduction in water quality.

Furthermore, both a concentration-based AMEL and MDEL remain for TSS, as well as an average discharge flow prohibition that limits the amount of flow that can be discharged to the receiving water. The combination of concentration-based effluent limits and a flow prohibition in this Order are equivalent to a mass-based effluent limitation, which was a redundant limit contained in previous Orders by multiplying the concentration-based effluent limits and permitted average discharge flow by a conversion factor to determine the mass-based effluent limitation. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the removal of the mass-based effluent limits for TSS does not result in an allowed increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving water. Thus, the removal of the mass-based effluent limit for TSS is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Antidegradation Policy permitted surface water discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Anti-Degradation Policy. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of BPTC of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

- b. **Groundwater.** The Discharger utilizes unlined settling ponds for treatment of filter backwash water. Filter backwash water contains constituents such as total dissolved solids (TDS), total settleable solids (TSS), specific conductivity, disinfection byproducts, and metals. Percolation from the settling ponds may result in an increase in the concentration of these constituents in groundwater. The State Anti-Degradation Policy generally prohibits the Central Valley Water Board from authorizing activities that will result in the degradation of high-quality waters unless it has been shown that:

- i. The degradation will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in state and regional policies, including violation of one or more water quality objectives;
- ii The degradation will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated future beneficial uses;
- ii The discharger will employ Best Practicable Treatment or Control (BPTC) to minimize degradation; and
- iv. The degradation is consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state.

This Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to groundwater from that allowed in the previous Order.

In July 2018, the Discharger submitted a technical memorandum to explore the feasibility of installing groundwater monitoring wells to observe impacts to groundwater, if any, from the settling ponds. Because of the geologic setting of the ponds and their close proximity to Magalia Reservoir, the technical memorandum concluded any groundwater that may be impacted by the settling ponds would discharge to the reservoir and therefore groundwater monitoring was unnecessary. Accordingly, based on RSW-001 water quality monitoring data collected during the term of the previous Order, water quality degradation is negligible and will not unreasonably affect beneficial uses. Settling ponds to treat filter backwash water is standard industry practice and constitutes BPTC of the discharge. Negligible groundwater degradation that may be occurring due to the operation of a drinking water plant is consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state.

5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on TSS and settleable solids. Restrictions on TSS and settleable solids are discussed in IV.B. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements.

WQBELs have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant WQBELs were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The procedures for calculating the individual WQBELs for priority pollutants are based on the CTR implemented by the SIP, which was approved by U.S. EPA on 18 May 2000. Collectively, this Order's restrictions on

individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

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

Table F-16 Summary of Final Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations	Basis
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	AMEL 4 MDEL 7.5	CTR
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	AMEL 0.011 MDEL 0.019	NAWQC
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	AMEL 30 MDEL 50	BPJ
Settleable Solids	mL/L	AMEL 0.1 MDEL 0.2	BP
pH	Standard Units	Instantaneous Max 8.5 Instantaneous Min 6.5	BP
Chronic Toxicity	Pass/Fail	MDEL: Pass MMEL: Pass	TOX

Table F-16 Notes:

- BPJ** – Based on best professional judgment.
BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.
CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.
NAWQC – Based on U.S. EPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.
TOX – Based on the Statewide Toxicity Provisions.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water

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

- a. **Bacteria.** On 7 August 2018 the State Water Board adopted Resolution No. 2018-0038 establishing Bacteria Provisions, which are specifically titled “Part 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California—Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality Standards Variance Policy” and “Amendment to the Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California—Bacteria Provisions and a Water Quality Standards Variance Policy.” The Bacteria Water Quality Objectives established in the Bacteria Provisions supersede any numeric water quality objective for bacteria for the REC-1 beneficial use contained in a water quality control plan before the effective date of the Bacteria Provisions.

The Bacteria Water Quality Objectives correspond with the risk protection level of 32 illnesses per 1,000 recreators and use E. coli as the indicator of pathogens in freshwaters and enterococci as the indicator of pathogens in estuarine waters and ocean waters.

The Bacteria Provisions provide that where a permit, waste discharge requirement (WDR), or waiver of WDR includes an effluent limitation or discharge requirement that is derived from a water quality objective or other guidance to control bacteria (for any beneficial use) that is more stringent than the Bacteria Water Quality Objective, the Bacteria Water Quality Objective would not be implemented in the permit, WDR, or waiver of WDR.

This standard has not been met in this Order, therefore, the Bacteria Water Quality Objective has been implemented as a receiving water limitation.

The bacteria receiving water limitation in this Order has been established based on the Bacterial Water Quality Objective for inland surface waters, which requires the six-week rolling geometric mean of Escherichia coli (E. coli) shall not exceed 100 colony forming units (cfu) per 100 milliliters (mL), calculated weekly, and a statistical threshold value (STV) of 320 cfu/100 mL not to be exceeded by more than 10 percent of the samples collected in a calendar month, calculated in a static manner.

B. Groundwater

1. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater 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 prohibit 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 PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

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

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

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Mercury.** This provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order in the event mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted. In addition, this Order may be reopened if the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to NPDES permits.
- b. **Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability (CV-SALTS).** On 17 January 2020, certain Basin Plan Amendments to incorporate new strategies for addressing ongoing salt and nitrate accumulation in the Central Valley became effective. Other provisions subject to U.S. EPA approval became effective on 2 November 2020, when approved by U.S. EPA. As the Central Valley Water Board moves forward to implement those provisions that are now in effect, this Order may be amended or modified to incorporate new or modified requirements necessary for implementation of the Basin Plan Amendments. More information regarding these Amendments can be found on the [Central Valley Salinity Alternatives for Long-Term Sustainability](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/salinity/) (CV-SALTS) web page:
(https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/salinity/)
- c. **Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate, effluent toxicity through a site-specific Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE). This Order may be reopened to include revised chronic toxicity limitations, revised acute toxicity limitations, and/or limitations for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE.
- d. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013, the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2013-0098, amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking Water Policy. The State Water Board approved the Drinking Water Policy on 3 December 2013. This Order may be reopened

to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.

2. **Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements**

- a. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE). Pursuant to the Toxicity Provisions**, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE when any combination of two or more MDEL or MMEL exceedances occur within a single toxicity calendar month or within two successive toxicity calendar months. In addition, if other information indicates toxicity (e.g., results of additional monitoring, results of monitoring at a higher concentration than the IWC, fish kills, intermittent recurring toxicity), the Central Valley Water Board may require a TRE. A TRE may also be required when there is no effluent available to complete a routine monitoring test or MMEL compliance test. MRP Section V.F. provides additional details regarding the TRE.

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

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP).** The Basin Plan includes a Salt Control Program for discharges to groundwater and surface water. The Salt Control Program is a phased approach to address salinity in the Central Valley Region. During Phase I the focus will be on conducting a Prioritization and Optimization (P&O) Study to provide information for subsequent phases of the Salt Control Program. During Phase I, the Salt Control Program includes two compliance pathways for dischargers to choose; a Conservative Salinity Permitting Approach and an Alternative Salinity Permitting Approach.

The Discharger submitted a notice to intent for the Salt Control Program on 25 February 2022 indicating its intent to meet the Alternative Salinity Permitting Approach. Under the Alternative Permitting Approach, the Basin Plan requires dischargers implement salinity minimization measures to maintain existing salinity levels and participate in the P&O Study. The Discharger's NOI demonstrated adequate participation in the P&O and this Order requires continued participation to meeting the requirements of the Alternative Salinity Permitting Approach. This Order also requires continued implementation of the Discharger's SEMP.

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

- a. **Settling/Drying Pond Operation Requirements.**
 - i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.

- ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
- iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular.
 - (a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.
 - (b) Weeds shall be minimized.
 - (c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
- vii. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- viii. 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 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- ix. Freeboard in the emergency storage ponds shall not be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow), except if lesser freeboard does not threaten the integrity of the pond, no overflow of the pond occurs, and lesser freeboard is due to direct precipitation or storm water runoff occurring as a result of annual precipitation with greater than a 100-year recurrence interval, or a storm event with an intensity greater than a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.
- x. Prior to the onset of the rainy season of each year, available pond storage capacity shall at least equal the volume necessary to comply with the operating specification contained at section vii above.
- xi. The monthly average discharge flow shall not exceed 0.6 mgd.
- xii. 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.

xiii. 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).

xiv. Ponds shall not have a pH less than 6.5 or greater than 8.5.

5. Special Provisions for POTWs – Not Applicable

6. Other Special Provisions

a. **Solids Management Plan.** The Solids Management Plan is required to ensure the Discharger properly handles solids wastes generated onsite to prevent nuisance, protect public health, and to protect groundwater quality.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E of this Order establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The burden, including costs, of these monitoring and reporting requirements bears a reasonable relationship to the need for the reports and the benefits to be obtained therefrom. The Discharger, as owner and operator of the Facility, is required to comply with these requirements, which are necessary to determine compliance with this Order. The following provides additional rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this facility.

Water Code section 13176, subdivision (a), states: “The analysis of any material required by [Water Code sections 13000-16104] shall be performed by a laboratory that has accreditation or certification pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with section 100825) of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 101 of the Health and Safety Code.” The DDW accredits laboratories through its Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

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

A. Influent Monitoring

1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (e.g., BOD₅ and TSS reduction requirements). The monitoring frequencies and sample types have been retained from Order R5-2020-0016.

B. Effluent Monitoring

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(i)(2) effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations. 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. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types have been retained from Order R5-2020-0016, except as noted in Table F-17, below:

Table F-17 Summary of Monitoring Changes

Parameter, Units	Type of Monitoring	Prior Sample Frequency	Revised Sample Frequency	Reason for Change
Diazinon	Effluent	--	Annual	To assess compliance with TMDL
Chlorpyrifos	Effluent	--	Annual	To assess compliance with TMDL

C. 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. Receiving surface water monitoring frequencies and sample types have been retained from Order R5-2020-0016.

2. Groundwater – Not Applicable

D. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

Aquatic toxicity testing is necessary to evaluate the aggregate toxic effect of a mixture of toxicants in the effluent on the receiving water. Acute toxicity testing is conducted over a short time period and measures mortality, while chronic toxicity testing is conducted over a short or longer period and may measure mortality, reproduction, and growth. For this permit, aquatic toxicity testing is to be performed following methods identified in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 40, part 136, or other U.S. EPA-approved methods, or included in the following U.S. EPA method

manuals: Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition (EPA-821-R-02-013).

Quarterly chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the chronic toxicity effluent limitations.

1. The discharge is subject to determination of "Pass" or "Fail" from a chronic toxicity test using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) statistical t-test approach described in *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, 2010), Appendix A, Figure A-1 and Table A-1 (Chronic Freshwater and East Coast Methods) and Appendix B, Table B-1.

2. The null hypothesis (Ho) for the TST statistical approach is:

Mean discharge IWC response \leq RMD x Mean control response, where the chronic RMD = 0.75.

A test result that rejects this null hypothesis is reported as "Pass." A test result that does not reject this null hypothesis is reported as "Fail."

3. The relative "Percent Effect" at the discharge IWC is defined and reported as:

Percent Effect = ((Mean control response – Mean discharge IWC response) / Mean control response) x 100.

This is a t-test (formally Student's t-Test), a statistical analysis comparing two sets of replicate observations, i.e., a control and IWC. The purpose of this statistical test is to determine if the means of the two sets of observations are different (i.e., if the IWC or receiving water concentration differs from the control, the test result is "Pass" or "Fail"). The Welch's t-test employed by the TST statistical approach is an adaptation of Student's t-test and is used with two samples having unequal variances.

4. **Sensitive Species Screening.** The Discharger shall perform rescreening to re-evaluate the most sensitive species if there is a significant change in the nature of the discharge. If there are no significant changes during the permit term, a rescreening must be performed prior to permit reissuance and results submitted with the Report of Waste Discharge. Species sensitivity screening for chronic toxicity shall include, at a minimum, chronic WET testing four consecutive calendar quarters using the water flea (*Ceriodaphnia dubia*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), and green alga (*Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*). The tests shall be performed at an IWC of no less than 100 percent effluent and one control. For rescreening, if the first two species sensitivity re-screening events result in no change in the most sensitive species, the Discharger may cease the species sensitive re-screening testing and the most sensitive species will remain unchanged.

The most sensitive species to be used for chronic toxicity testing was determined in accordance with the process outlined in the MRP section V.F. Based on the Discharger's last 5 years of chronic toxicity data, there were no results of "Fail" at the IWC using the TST statistical approach. The species that exhibited the highest percent effect was the water flea (*Ceriodaphnia dubia*), with a percent effect of 12.3 percent. Consequently, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* has been established as the most sensitive species for chronic WET testing.

5. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE).** The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires chronic WET testing to demonstrate compliance with the numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation. The Discharger is required to initiate a TRE when there is any combination of two or more chronic toxicity MDEL or MMEL violations within a single calendar month or within two successive toxicity calendar months. In addition, if other information indicates toxicity (e.g., results of additional monitoring, results of monitoring at a higher concentration than the IWC, fish kills, intermittent recurring toxicity), the Central Valley Water Board may require a TRE. A TRE may also be required when there is no effluent available to complete a routine monitoring test, MMET test, or MMEL compliance test.

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. **Solids Monitoring**

Solids monitoring is not required by this Order. The Discharger does not dispose of solids at the Facility. Waste solids from the settling basins are hauled off to a class III landfill.

2. **Water Supply Monitoring – Not Applicable**

3. **UV Disinfection System Monitoring - Not Applicable**

4. **Pond Monitoring – Not Applicable**

5. **Land Discharge Monitoring – Not Applicable**

6. **Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring**

In accordance with section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring is required for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires quarterly effluent characterization monitoring event between 1 April 2026 and 31 March 2027 and quarterly ambient background characterization monitoring event between 1 April 2026 and 31 March 2027 for priority pollutant constituents located in Appendix A to 40 C.F.R. part 423 during the term of the permit, in order to collect data to conduct an RPA for the next permit renewal.

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

A. Notification of Interested Persons

The Central Valley Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through internet posting and through physical posting (posting at city offices, county courthouse or city hall, local newspaper).

The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the [Central Valley Water Board's website](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_info/meetings/) (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_info/meetings/)

B. Written Comments

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

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Central Valley Water Board, the written comments were due at the Central Valley Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on 16 December 2024.

C. Public Hearing

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

Date: 20-21 February 2025

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Location: Online OR Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

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

D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements

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

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

Or by email at waterqualitypetitions@waterboards.ca.gov

[Instructions on how to file a petition for review](#)

(http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instructions.shtml) are available on the Internet.

E. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge, other supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Central Valley Water Board by calling (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 Central Valley Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Michael Collins at (530) 224-4785, or Michael.Collins@waterboards.ca.gov.

ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Aluminum	µg/L	409	163	200	470	220	--	--	--	200	No
Bromoform	µg/L	<0.11	<0.11	4.3	--	--	4.3	360		80	No
Chloride	mg/L	4.17	1.86	250	860	230	--	--	--	250	No
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.64	1.43	3.2	4.4	3.3	1,300	--	--	1,000	No
Chloroform	µg/L	13.5	11.7	60	--	--	60	2000	--	80	No
Dibromochloromethane	µg/L	0.142	0.086	0.41	--	--	0.41	34	--	80	No
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	3.7	0.81	0.56	--	--	0.56	46	--	80	Yes
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	94	89	700	--	--	--	--	--	700	No
Sulfate	mg/L	5.6	1.7	250	--	--	--	--	--	250	No
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	273	83	500	--	--	--	--	--	500	No
Total Trihalomethanes	µg/L	17.34	12.6	80	--	--	--	--	--	80	No
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	9.8	1.7	42	42	42	7,400	26,000	--	5,000	No

Attachment G Table Notes:

1. All inorganic concentrations are given as a total concentration.
2. A hardness value of 29 mg/L of CaCO₃ was used to calculate the hardness-dependent metals criteria.

3. The data range for the table is from 5/2021 to 6/2024, however the zinc data range for the table is from 9/2023 to 12/2023.

Abbreviations used in this table:

MEC =	Maximum Effluent Concentration
B =	Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect
C =	Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis
CMC =	Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)
CCC =	Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)
Water & Org =	Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)
Org Only =	Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)
Basin Plan =	Numeric Site-Specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective
MCL =	Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level
NA =	Not Available
ND =	Non-detect

**ATTACHMENT H-1 – CALCULATION OF WQBELS
 HUMAN HEALTH WQBELS CALCULATIONS**

Parameter	Units	Criteria	Mean Background Concentration	Effluent CV	Dilution Factor	MDEL/AMEL Multiplier	AMEL Multiplier	AMEL	MDEL	AWEL
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	0.21	0.53	9	1.89	1.48	4	7.5	--

Attachment H-1 Table Notes:

- CV was established according to section 1.4 of the SIP.

Abbreviations used in this table:

CV = Coefficient of Variation
 MDEL = Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation
 AMEL = Average Monthly Effluent Limitation
 MDEL = Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation
 AWEL = Average Weekly Effluent Limitation

**ATTACHMENT H-2 – CALCULATION OF WQBELS
 AQUATIC LIFE WQBELS CALCULATIONS**

Parameter	Units	CMC Criteria	CCC Criteria	B	Effluent CV	CMC Dilution Factor	CCC Dilution Factor	ECA Multiplier _{acute}	LTA _{acute}	ECA Multiplier _{chronic}	LTA _{chronic}	AMEL Multiplier ₉₅	AWEL Multiplier	MDEL Multiplier ₉₉	AMEL	AWEL	MDEL
Chlorpyrifos	µg/L														See Table Note 1		
Diazinon	µg/L														See Table Note 1		

Attachment H-2 Table Notes:

1. See Attachment F, Section IV.C.3.a.i for chlorpyrifos and diazinon WQBEL calculations.

Abbreviations used in this table:

B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect
 CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)
 CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)
 CV = Coefficient of Variation (established in accordance with section 1.4 of the SIP)
 ECA = Effluent Concentration Allowance
 LTA = Aquatic Life Calculations – Long-Term Average
 MDEL = Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation
 AMEL = Average Monthly Effluent Limitation
 MDEL = Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation
 AWEL = Average Weekly Effluent Limitation