

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Contents

Attachment F – Fact Sheet.....	F-3
I. Permit Information	F-3
II. Facility Description	F-4
A. Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment	F-4
B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters.....	F-5
C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Effluent Characterization.....	F-6
D. Compliance Summary.....	F-11
E. Planned Changes	F-11
III. Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations.....	F-12
A. Legal Authorities	F-12
B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).....	F-12
C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans	F-12
D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303 (d) List	F-15
E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations.....	F-15
IV. Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-15
A. Discharge Prohibitions.....	F-16
B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-17
1. Scope and Authority.....	F-17
2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations	F-17
C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs).....	F-18
1. Scope and Authority.....	F-18
2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives.....	F-18
3. Determining the Need for WQBELs	F-19
4. WQBEL Calculations	F-25
5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)	F-33
D. Final Effluent Limitations.....	F-34
E. Interim Effluent Limitations.....	F-35
F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-35
G. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-35
V. Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations.....	F-35
A. Surface Water.....	F-35
B. Groundwater	F-35
VI. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	F-35
A. Influent Monitoring	F-36
B. Effluent Monitoring.....	F-36
C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements	F-36
D. Receiving Water Monitoring.....	F-37
1. Surface Water Monitoring	F-37
2. Groundwater	F-37
E. Other Monitoring Requirements.....	F-37
VII. Rationale for Provisions.....	F-37
A. Standard Provisions.....	F-37

B.	Special Provisions.....	F-38
1.	Reopener Provisions.....	F-38
2.	Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-38
3.	Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention	F-38
4.	Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-38
5.	Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)	F-38
6.	Other Special Provisions.....	F-39
7.	Compliance Schedules	F-39
VIII.	Public Participation	F-40
A.	Notification of Interested Parties	F-40
B.	Written Comments	F-40
C.	Public Hearing	F-50
D.	Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions.....	F-50
E.	Information and Copying.....	F-50
F.	Register of Interested Persons	F-50
G.	Additional Information	F-51

Tables

Table F-1.	Facility Information	F-3
Table F-2.	Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data, Conventional Pollutants, Discharge Point 001	F-6
Table F-3.	Historic Effluent Limitations, Toxic Pollutants, Discharge Point 001	F-6
Table F-4.	Basin Plan Beneficial Uses for the Pacific Ocean	F-13
Table F-5.	Ocean Plan Beneficial Uses	F-14
Table F-6.	Secondary Treatment Requirements.....	F-17
Table F-7.	Summary of Technology-Based Effluent Limitations	F-17
Table F-8.	RPA Results for Discharges to Monterey Bay	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table F-9.	Background Concentrations (Cs) - Ocean Plan (Table 3)	F-26
Table F-10.	Water Quality Objectives (Co)–Ocean Plan (Table 1)	F-26
Table F-11.	Water Quality Objectives (Co)–Ocean Plan (Table 1)	F-27
Table F-12.	Water Quality Objectives (Co)–Ocean Plan (Table 1)	F-27
Table F-13.	Effluent Limitations for the Protection of Marine Aquatic Life	F-29
Table F-14.	Effluent Limitations for the Protection of Human Health (Non-Carcinogens)....	F-30
Table F-15.	Effluent Limitations for the Protection of Human Health (Carcinogens).....	F-31

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

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

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

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the facility.

Table F-1. Facility Information

WDID	3B270118002
Discharger	Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency
Name of Facility	Regional Treatment Plant
Facility Address	14811 Del Monte Boulevard
	Marina, California 93933
	Monterey County
Administrative Office	5 Harris Court, Building D
	Monterey, California 93940
	Monterey County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	James Dix, Operations Manager (831) 883-6183
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	James Dix, Operations Manager (831) 883-6183
Environmental Contact	Garrett Haertel, Compliance Engineer, (831) 883-6176
Mailing Address	5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey, California 93940
Billing Address	5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey, California 93940
Type of Facility	POTW
Major or Minor Facility	Major
Threat to Water Quality	2
Complexity	A
Pretreatment Program	Yes
Recycling Requirements	Producer
Facility Permitted Flow	29.6 million gallons per day (MGD)
Facility Design Flow	29.6 MGD (Average Dry Weather Flow)
Watershed	Lower Salinas Valley HA (309.10)
Receiving Waters	Pacific Ocean (Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, outside the Zone of Prohibition)
Receiving Water Type	Ocean Water

- A. The Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) (hereinafter, the Discharger) is the owner and operator of a wastewater treatment plant (hereinafter, Facility), which treats domestic, commercial, and industrial wastewaters collected from the cities of Monterey, Pacific Grove, Del Rey Oaks, Sand City, Marina, and Salinas; the Seaside County Sanitation District; the Castroville, Moss Landing and Boronda Community Service Districts; and Fort Ord. The wastewater treatment facility is located at 14811 Del Monte Boulevard, Marina, Monterey County.

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

- B. The Facility discharges wastewater to the Pacific Ocean (via Monterey Bay), a water of the United States, and is currently regulated by Order No. R3-2008-0008, which was adopted on March 20, 2008, expired on April 30, 2013, and administratively extended until the Board adopts this new permit. The terms and conditions of the current Order will be automatically continued and remain in effect until new Waste Discharge Requirements and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit are adopted pursuant to this Order.
- C. The Discharger filed a Report of Waste Discharge and submitted an application for reissuance of its Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and NPDES permit on November 21, 2012. The application was deemed complete on March 15, 2013.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

A. Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment

The MRWPCA, which currently serves a population of approximately 252,000, was created in 1972. MRWPCA consists of and provides regional wastewater treatment, disposal, and reclamation facilities for the cities of Monterey, Pacific Grove, Del Rey Oaks, Sand City, Marina, and Salinas; the Seaside County Sanitation District; the Castroville, Moss Landing and Boronda Community Services Districts; and Fort Ord. Each member entity retains ownership and operating/maintenance responsibility for wastewater collection and transport systems up to the point of connection with interceptors owned and operated by the Discharger. Residential, commercial, and industrial wastewater is conveyed to the MRWPCA Regional Treatment Plant, which has a design treatment capacity of 29.6 MGD (average dry weather flow) and currently treats approximately 18 MGD. The Facility began operation in 1990, replacing six local wastewater treatment facilities.

The MRWPCA currently accepts 30,000 – 50,000 gallons per day (gpd) of brine wastes by truck from business entities which would otherwise be discharging to the sanitary sewer system. Such wastewaters include softener regenerant wastes and reverse osmosis brines, which are now trucked to the Regional Treatment Plant instead of being discharged to the collection system. Because irrigation uses of recycled wastewater are sensitive to elevated levels of total dissolved solids (TDS), the MRWPCA has sought to keep such elevated TDS wastewaters segregated from the influent flow of the Regional

Treatment Plant. Brine wastes are held in a 375,000 gallon (approximate) lined holding pond at the Regional Treatment Plant and ultimately discharged directly to or blended with secondary treated wastewater before being discharged through Discharge Point 001.

Wastewater treatment at the Regional Treatment Plant includes aerated grit removal, primary clarifiers, trickling filters, solids contact, secondary clarifiers, and filtration. Undisinfected secondary clarifier effluent is discharged through Discharge Point 001. Sludge/biosolids are anaerobically digested and sent to two screw presses constructed in 2007. The presses have replaced the sludge drying beds and belt filter press. The holding lagoons and some of the drying beds may still be utilized in emergency situations. Dried solids are then hauled to the Monterey Regional Waste Management District's landfill in Marina, California, adjacent to the Regional Treatment Plant, where it is mixed with wood products and used for slope cover.

In winter months, secondary treated wastewater from the Regional Treatment Plant is discharged through a diffuser, positioned 11,260 feet offshore at a depth of approximately 100 feet, to Monterey Bay. In summer months, treated wastewater is recycled for irrigation of 12,000 acres of farmland in the northern Salinas Valley. Tertiary treatment of recycled wastewater is provided for design flows of up to 29.6 MGD by the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project (SVRP), which holds tertiary treated wastewater in an 80 acre-foot storage pond before it is distributed to farmland by the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP). The irrigation use of recycled wastewater reduces regional dependence on and use of local groundwater, thereby minimizing seawater intrusion. The SVRP portion of the MRWPCA facility and use of recycled water is regulated via separate water recycling requirements.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

Discharge from the Regional Treatment Plant at Discharge Point 001 occurs through an 11,260-foot outfall/diffuser system that terminates at a depth of approximately 100 feet in the Pacific Ocean (Monterey Bay) at 36°, 43', 40" N. latitude and 121°, 50', 15" W longitude. The receiving water is part of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, designated as such on September 15, 1992. The purpose of the National Marine Sanctuaries Program is to protect areas of the marine environment which possess conservation, recreational, ecological, historical, research, educational, or aesthetic qualities of special national significance. The first priority of the Program is the long-term protection of resources within designated sanctuaries. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary has been recognized for its unique and diverse biological and physical characteristics. The MRWPCA outfall/diffuser system is located outside the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Zone of Prohibition.

Discharges through Discharge Point 001 consist of secondary treated wastewater and/or brine wastes, as described above. The minimum probable dilution for Discharge Point 001 is 145 to 1, a figure that has been used by Central Coast Water Board staff to determine the need for water quality-based effluent limitations and, if necessary, to calculate those limitations.

C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Effluent Characterization

Effluent limitations contained in the previous Order for discharges from Discharge Point 001 and representative monitoring data for Monitoring Location EFF-001, for the last five years of the permit term (i.e., 2008 through 2012), are presented in the following tables. Wastewater monitored at Monitoring Location EFF-001 is essentially a combination of brine wastes and secondary effluent. Effluent monitoring data that are reported for compliance purposes represent flow-weighted concentrations based on each flow stream contribution, which ensures a representative sample of effluent discharged from the Regional Treatment Plant.

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data, Conventional Pollutants, Discharge Point 001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				Monitoring Data (7/08 – 11/12)
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum	Maximum Reported Value
CBOD ₅	mg/L	25	40	85	--	26 ^[1]
	lb/day	6,200	10,000	21,000	--	--
TSS	mg/L	30	45	90	--	47 ^[2]
	lb/day	7,400	11,000	22,000	--	--
CBOD ₅ , and TSS	%	Removal by treatment shall not be less than 85 percent				--
Settleable Solids	mL/L/hr	1.0	1.5	3.0	--	0.3
Turbidity	NTU	75	100	230	--	18
Oil & Grease	mg/L	25	40	75	--	16
	lb/day	6,200	10,000	19,000	--	--
pH	pH Units	6.0 – 9.0				8.4
Total coliform bacteria	MPN/100 mL	1,000	--	--	10,000	1,600

^[1] This value represents the highest reported daily maximum value for CBOD₅ (September 2009). There were no exceedances of effluent limitations for CBOD₅ during the permit term.

^[2] This value represents the highest reported daily maximum value for TSS (July 2008). There were no exceedances of effluent limitations for TSS during the permit term.

Table F-3. Historic Effluent Limitations, Toxic Pollutants, Discharge Point 001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				Monitoring Data (7/08 – 11/12)
		6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum	30-Day Average	Maximum Reported Value
Arsenic	µg/L	733	4,237	11,245	--	4.0
	lbs/day	181	1,050	2,780	--	--
Cadmium	µg/L	146	584	1,460	--	< 5
	lbs/day	36	144	360	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				Monitoring Data (7/08 – 11/12)
		6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum	30-Day Average	Maximum Reported Value
Chromium (Hexavalent)	µg/L	292	1,168	2,920	--	130
	lbs/day	72.1	288	721	--	--
Copper	µg/L	148	1,462	4,090	--	10
	lbs/day	36.5	361	1,010	--	--
Lead	µg/L	292	1,168	2,920	--	0.5
	lbs/day	72.1	288	721	--	--
Mercury	µg/L	5.7675	23.2875	58.3275	--	0.8
	lbs/day	1.42	5.75	14.4	--	--
Nickel	µg/L	730	2,920	7,300	--	3.5
	lbs/day	180	721	1,800	--	--
Selenium	µg/L	2,190	8,760	21,900	--	57
	lbs/day	541	2,160	5,410	--	--
Silver	µg/L	79	385.6	998.8	--	< 0.19
	lbs/day	19.5	95.2	247	--	--
Zinc	µg/L	1,760	10,520	28,040	--	20
	lbs/day	434	2,600	6,920	--	--
Cyanide	µg/L	146	584	1,460	--	59
	lbs/day	36	144	360	--	--
Total Residual Chlorine	µg/L	292	1,168	8,760	--	460 ^[1]
	lbs/day	72.1	288	2,200	--	--
Ammonia (as N)	µg/L	87,600	350,400	876,000	--	36,400
	lbs/day	21,600	86,500	220,000	--	--
Acute Toxicity	TUa	--	4.65	--	--	2.5
Chronic Toxicity	TUc	--	146	--	--	40
Phenolic Compounds (non-chlorinated)	µg/L	4,380	17,520	43,800	--	< 2
	lbs/day	1,080	4,330	10,800	--	--
Endosulfan	µg/L	1.314	2.6328	3.942	--	< 0.05
	lbs/day	0.324	0.649	0.973	--	--
Endrin	µg/L	0.292	0.584	0.876	--	< 0.005
	lbs/day	0.072	0.144	0.216	--	--
HCH	µg/L	0.584	1.168	1.752	--	0.034
	lbs/day	0.14	0.288	0.433	--	--
Radioactivity	Not to exceed limits specified in Title 17, Division 1, Chapter 5, Subchapter 4, Group 3, Article 3, Section 30253 of the California Code of Regulations. Reference to Section 30253 is prospective, including future changes to any incorporated provisions of federal law, as the changes take effect.					408
Acrolein	µg/L	--	--	--	32,120	< 5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	7,930	--
Antimony	µg/L	--	--	--	175,000	0.65

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				Monitoring Data (7/08 – 11/12)
		6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum	30-Day Average	Maximum Reported Value
	lbs/day	--	--	--	43,300	--
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	µg/L	--	--	--	642.4	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	159	--
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	µg/L	--	--	--	175,000	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	43,300	--
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	--	--	--	83,220	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	20,500	--
Chromium (III)	µg/L	--	--	--	27,740,000	87
	lbs/day	--	--	--	6,850,000	--
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	511,000	< 5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	126,000	--
Dichlorobenzenes	µg/L	--	--	--	744,000	< 0.05
	lbs/day	--	--	--	184,000	--
Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	4,818,000	< 5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	1,190,000	--
Dimethyl Phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	119,720,000	< 2
	lbs/day	--	--	--	29,600,000	--
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	µg/L	--	--	--	32,120	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	7,930	--
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	--	--	--	584	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	140	--
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	--	--	--	598,600	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	148,000	--
Fluoranthene	µg/L	--	--	--	2,190	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	541	--
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	--	--	--	8,468	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	2,090	--
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	--	--	--	715.4	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	177	--
Thallium	µg/L	--	--	--	290	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	72	--
Toluene	µg/L	--	--	--	12,410,000	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	3,060,000	--
Tributyltin	µg/L	--	--	--	0.2044	< 0.05
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.0505	--
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	--	--	--	78,840,000	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	19,500,000	--
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	--	--	--	14.7	< 2
	lbs/day	--	--	--	3.6	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				Monitoring Data (7/08 – 11/12)
		6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum	30-Day Average	Maximum Reported Value
Aldrin	µg/L	--	--	--	0.003212	< 0.005
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.000793	--
Benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	861.4	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	213	--
Benzidine	µg/L	--	--	--	0.010074	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.00249	--
Beryllium	µg/L	--	--	--	4.818	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	1.19	--
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	--	--	--	6.57	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	1.62	--
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	511	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	126	--
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	--	--	--	131.4	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	32.4	--
Chlordane	µg/L	--	--	--	0.003358	< 0.005
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.000829	--
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	--	--	--	1,256	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	310	--
Chloroform	µg/L	--	--	--	18,980	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	4,690	--
DDT	µg/L	--	--	--	0.02482	0.010
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.00613	--
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	--	--	--	2,628	< 5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	649	--
3,3-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	--	--	--	1.1826	< 0.025
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.292	--
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	--	--	--	4,090	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	1,010	--
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	131.4	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	32.4	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	--	--	--	905	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	223	--
Dichloromethane	µg/L	--	--	--	65,700	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	16,200	--
1,3-Dichloropropene	µg/L	--	--	--	1,299.4	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	321	--
Dieldrin	µg/L	--	--	--	0.00584	< 0.005
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.0014	--
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	--	--	--	379.6	< 2

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				Monitoring Data (7/08 – 11/12)
		6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum	30-Day Average	Maximum Reported Value
	lbs/day	--	--	--	93.7	--
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	--	--	--	23.36	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	5.77	--
Halomethanes	µg/L	--	--	--	18,980	< 0.05
	lbs/day	--	--	--	4,690	--
Heptachlor	µg/L	--	--	--	0.0073	< 0.005
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.0018	--
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	--	--	--	0.0029	< 0.005
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.00072	--
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	--	--	--	0.03066	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.00757	--
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	--	--	--	2,044	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	505	--
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	--	--	--	365	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	90.1	--
Isophorone	µg/L	--	--	--	106,580	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	26,300	--
N-nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	1,065.8	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	263	--
N-nitrosdi-N-propylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	55.5	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	13.7	--
N-nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	365	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	90.1	--
PAHs	µg/L	--	--	--	1.2848	< 0.05
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.317	--
PCBs	µg/L	--	--	--	0.002774	< 0.005
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.000685	--
TCDD Equivalents	µg/L	--	--	--	5.694x10 ⁻⁷	< 0.000011
	lbs/day	--	--	--	1.4x10 ⁻⁷	--
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	--	--	--	335.8	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	82.9	--
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	290	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	72	--
Toxaphene	µg/L	--	--	--	0.03066	< 0.005
	lbs/day	--	--	--	0.00757	--
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	3,942	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	973	--
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	--	--	--	1,372	< 0.5

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				Monitoring Data (7/08 – 11/12)
		6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum	30-Day Average	Maximum Reported Value
	lbs/day	--	--	--	339	--
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	--	--	--	42.34	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	10.5	--
Vinyl Chloride	µg/L	--	--	--	5,256	< 0.5
	lbs/day	--	--	--	1,300	--

Source: Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, Order R3-2008-0008. Effluent data for the period from July 2008 to November 2012 retrieved from CIWQS and ICIS.

^[1] This value represents the maximum reported value for total residual chlorine (August 2012). The effluent data for the period from July 2008 to November 2012 included only two values.

D. Compliance Summary

Based on the effluent data available for the period from July 2008 to November 2012, the Discharger did not violate effluent limitations.

A NPDES Permit Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI) was conducted at the Regional Treatment Plant on January 8, 2013.

E. Planned Changes

Brine Disposal

During the growing season, typically from March or April through October or November, MRWPCA recycles almost 100 percent of wastewater flows for irrigation uses. A small portion of secondary effluent is retained for blending with brine prior to disposal. To combat high salt concentrations in recycled wastewater, levels that are harmful to irrigated crops, in addition to a source control program, MRWPCA operates a brine disposal project to remove salts from influent flows. Approximately 4.8 million gallons of brine per year are currently diverted from the collection system and discharged directly to MRWPCA's brine disposal facilities. These wastes are not treated with influent flows and therefore do not contribute TDS to recycled wastewater.

Because of benefits to agriculture and reductions in dependence on and use of local groundwater, the MRWPCA's wastewater recycling program is very successful and enhanced by the control of salt concentrations in recycled wastewater. MRWPCA, therefore, anticipates that its brine disposal activities will increase.

This Order establishes effluent limitations, prohibitions, and monitoring requirements applicable to the discharge of brine wastes. Through the requirements of this Order the Central Coast Water Board can ensure that discharges of brine remain consistent with applicable requirements of the Clean Water Act and NPDES implementing regulations, as well as the Basin and Ocean Plans.

Groundwater Replenishment Project

The MRWPCA is moving towards pilot study of providing tertiary treatment of wastewater by micro-filtration (MF) or ultra-filtration (UF), reverse osmosis (RO), and ultra-violet (UV) hydrogen peroxide advanced oxidation. The purpose of the study is to examine the feasibility of groundwater injection of treated wastewater. This study will not result in changes to the quantity or quality of wastewater discharged from the Regional Treatment Plant during the term of this Order and is, therefore, not addressed by this Order.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

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

A. Legal Authorities

This Order serves as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR's) pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) 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 for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters.

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Pursuant to Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21100 - through 21177.

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

1. Water Quality Control Plans. The Central Coast Water Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin* (the Basin Plan), which designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for receiving waters within the Region. To address ocean waters, the Basin Plan incorporates by reference the *Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California* (the Ocean Plan), which was adopted in 1972 and amended in 1978, 1983, 1988, 1990, 1997, 2000, 2005 and 2012. The most recent amendment to the Ocean Plan was adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (the State Water Board) on October 16, 2012, and became effective on August 19, 2013.

The Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, which establishes State policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply (MUN). Because of very high levels of total dissolved solids (TDS) in the Pacific Ocean, including Monterey Bay, the receiving waters for discharges from the Monterey

Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Regional Treatment Plant meet an exception to Resolution No. 88-63, which precludes waters with TDS levels greater than 3,000 mg/L from the MUN designation. Beneficial uses established by the Basin Plan for coastal waters between the Salinas River and Point Pinos are as follows:

Table F-4. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses for the Pacific Ocean

Discharge Point	Receiving Water	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Pacific Ocean (Monterey Bay)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Contact and Non-Contact Recreation • Industrial Service Supply • Navigation • Marine Habitat • Shellfish Harvesting • Commercial and Sport Fishing • Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species

To protect the beneficial uses, the Basin Plan establishes water quality objectives and implementation programs. This Order's requirements implement the Basin Plan.

2. **Thermal Plan.** The State Water Board adopted a *Water Quality Control Plan for Control of Temperature in the Coastal and Interstate Water and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California* (Thermal Plan) on May 18, 1972, and amended this plan on September 18, 1975. This plan contains the following temperature objective for existing discharges to enclosed bays and coastal waters of California.

Elevated temperature waste discharges shall comply with limitations necessary to assure protection of beneficial uses.

The Ocean Plan defines elevated temperature wastes as:

Liquid, solid, or gaseous material discharged at a temperature higher than the natural temperature of receiving water.

3. **California Ocean Plan.** The State Water Board adopted the *Water Quality Control Plan for Ocean Waters of California, California Ocean Plan* (Ocean Plan) in 1972 and amended it in 1978, 1983, 1988, 1990, 1997, 2000, 2005, 2009, and 2012. The State Water Board adopted the latest amendment on October 16, 2012, and was approved by the Office of Administrative Law on July 3, 2013, and subsequently the USEPA. The Ocean Plan is applicable, in its entirety, to point source discharges to the Pacific Ocean. The Ocean Plan identifies beneficial uses of ocean waters of the State to be protected as summarized in Table F-5, below.

Table F-5. Ocean Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Pacific Ocean (Monterey Bay)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial Water Supply • Water Contact and Non-Contact Recreation, including Aesthetic Enjoyment • Navigation • Commercial and Sport Fishing • Mariculture • Preservation and Enhancement of Designated Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) • Rare and Endangered Species • Marine Habitat • Fish Migration • Fish Spawning and Shellfish Harvesting

In order to protect the beneficial uses, the Ocean Plan establishes WQOs and a program of implementation. Requirements of this Order implement the Ocean Plan.

- 4. Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulation 40 C.F.R. § 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. Resolution 68-16 is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution 68-16 requires that the existing quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Central Coast 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 provisions of 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.
- 6. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402 (o)(2) and 303 (d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 (l) prohibit backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require effluent limitations in a reissued permit to be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions where limitations may be relaxed.
- 7. Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state, including protecting rare and endangered species. The discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.

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

CWA section 303 (d) requires states to identify specific water bodies where water quality standards are not expected to be met after implementation of technology-based effluent limitations on point sources. For all 303 (d) listed water bodies and pollutants, the Central Coast Water Board must develop and implement TMDLs (Total Maximum Daily Loads) that will specify WLAs (Waste Load Allocations) for point sources and Load Allocations for non-point sources.

Monterey Harbor is identified as impaired by metals and sediment toxicity on the State's 2008-2010 303 (d) list of impaired water bodies, which was approved by U.S. EPA on November 12, 2011. The discharge is approximately ten miles from Monterey Harbor and not anticipated to affect this impairment. The main body of Monterey Bay is not identified on the 303 (d) List as impaired.

E. Other Plans, Policies and Regulations

- 1. Discharges of Storm Water.** For the control of storm water discharged from the site of the wastewater treatment and disposal facilities, the Order requires, if applicable, the Discharger to seek authorization to discharge under and meet the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board's Water Quality Order 97-03-DWQ, NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001, *Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities Excluding Construction Activities*.
- 2. Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems (State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ).** This General Permit, adopted on May 2, 2006, is applicable to all "federal and state agencies, municipalities, counties, districts, and other public entities that own or operate sanitary sewer systems greater than one mile in length that collect and/or convey untreated or partially treated wastewater to a publicly owned treatment facility in the State of California." The purpose of the General Permit is to promote the proper and efficient management, operation, and maintenance of sanitary sewer systems and to minimize the occurrences and impacts of sanitary sewer overflows. The Order requires the Discharger to seek coverage under the General Permit, if applicable, and comply with its requirements. The Discharger has enrolled in the General Permit.

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. NPDES regulations establish two principal bases for effluent limitations. At 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 (a) permits are required to include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 (d) permits are required to include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. When

numeric water quality objectives have not been established, but a discharge has the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above a narrative criterion, WQBELs may be established using one or more of three methods described at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 (d) - 1) WQBELs may be established using a calculated water quality criterion derived from a proposed State criterion or an explicit State policy or regulation interpreting its narrative criterion; 2) WQBELs may be established on a case-by-case basis using U.S. EPA criteria guidance published under CWA Section 304 (a); or 3) WQBELs may be established using an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern.

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. Discharge Prohibition II.A (No discharge to Monterey Bay at a location other than as described by the Order). The Order authorizes a single, specific point of discharge to Monterey Bay; and this prohibition reflects CWA section 402's prohibition against discharges of pollutants except in compliance with the Act's permit requirements, effluent limitations, and other enumerated provisions. This prohibition is also retained from the previous permit.
2. Discharge Prohibition II.B (The rate of discharge to Monterey Bay shall not exceed 81.2 MGD). This prohibition reflects the design capacity of the ocean outfall and allows the discharge of blended secondary effluent and brine wastes above the design flow capacity of the secondary treatment facility.
3. Discharge Prohibition II.C (The influent flow to the secondary treatment system shall not exceed 29.6 MGD average dry weather flow and 75.6 MGD peak wet weather flow). This prohibition reflects the design capacity of the secondary treatment system and is intended to limit influent wastewater flows to that of the treatment facility design flows.
4. Discharge Prohibition II.D (Overflows and bypasses prohibited). The discharge of untreated or partially treated wastewater from the Discharger's collection, treatment, or disposal facilities represents an unauthorized bypass pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m) or an unauthorized discharge, which poses a threat to human health and/or aquatic life, and therefore, is explicitly prohibited by this Order.
5. Discharge Prohibition II.E (Discharges in a manner, except as described by the Order are prohibited). Because limitations and conditions of the Order have been prepared based on specific information provided by the Discharger and specific wastes described by the Discharger, the limitations and conditions of the Order do not adequately address waste streams not contemplated during drafting of the Order. To prevent the discharge of such waste streams that may be inadequately regulated, the Order prohibits the discharge of any waste that was not described by the Central Coast Water Board during the process of permit issuance.
6. Discharge Prohibition II.F (Discharges of radiological, chemical, or biological warfare agent or high level radioactive waste to the Ocean is prohibited). This prohibition restates a discharge prohibition established in section III. H of the Ocean Plan.

7. Discharge Prohibition II.G (Federal law prohibits the discharge of sludge by pipeline the Ocean. The discharge of municipal or industrial waste sludge directly to the Ocean or into a waste stream that discharges to the Ocean is prohibited. The discharge of sludge digester supernatant, without further treatment, directly to the Ocean or to a waste stream that discharges to the Ocean, is prohibited.) This prohibition reflects the prohibition in Chapter III. H of the Ocean Plan.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 (a) require that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards. Where the U.S. EPA has not yet developed technology based standards for a particular industry or a particular pollutant, CWA Section 402 (a) (1) and U.S. EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 125.3 authorize the use of best professional judgment (BPJ) to derive technology-based effluent limitations on a case-by-case basis. When BPJ is used, the permit writer must consider specific factors outlined at 40 C.F.R. § 125.3.

This Order includes limitations based on the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, as established at 40 C.F.R. part 133. The Secondary Treatment Regulation includes the following limitations applicable to all publicly owned treatment works (POTWs).

Table F-6. Secondary Treatment Requirements

Parameter	Effluent Limitation		
	30-Day Avg	7-Day Avg	Percent Removal ^[1]
CBOD ₅ ^[2]	25 mg/L	40 mg/L	85
TSS	30 mg/L	45 mg/L	85
pH	6.0 – 9.0		---

^[1] 30-day average

^[2] At the option of the permitting authority, effluent limitations for CBOD₅ may be substituted for those limitations specified for BOD₅.

In addition, the State Water Board, in Table 2 of the Ocean Plan, has established technology-based requirements, applicable to all POTWs, for oil and grease, suspended and settleable solids, turbidity, and pH.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

The following table summarizes technology-based effluent limitations established by the Order.

Table F-7. Summary of Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations			
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Maximum
CBOD ₅ ^[1]	mg/L	25	40	85	--

	lbs/day	6,200	10,000	21,000	--
TSS ^[1]	mg/L	30	45	90	--
	lbs/day	7,400	11,000	22,000	--
Oil & Grease	mg/L	25	40	75	--
	lbs/day	6,200	10,000	19,000	--
Settleable Solids	mL/L/hr	1.0	1.5	--	3.0
Turbidity	NTUs	75	100	--	230
pH	pH units	6.0 – 9.0 at all times			

^[1] 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85%.

All technology-based limitations are retained from the previous permit and are required by NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 133 and/or Table 2 of the Ocean Plan. Mass-based limitations for CBOD₅, TSS, and oil and grease are based on a discharge rate of 29.6 MGD, the average dry weather flow design treatment capacity of the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Regional Treatment Plant.

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 (d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard.

The process for determining “reasonable potential” and calculating WQBELs, when necessary, is intended to protect the designated uses of receiving waters as specified in the Basin and Ocean Plans, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in the Basin Plan and in other applicable State and federal rules, plans, and policies, including applicable water quality criteria from the Ocean Plan.

Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBELs must be established in accordance with the requirements of 40 C.F.R. § 122.44 (d) (1) (vi), 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.

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

Beneficial uses for ocean waters of the Central Coast Region are established by the Basin Plan and Ocean Plan and are described in section III.C of this Fact Sheet.

Water quality criteria applicable to ocean waters of the Region are established by the Ocean Plan, which includes water quality objectives for bacterial characteristics,

physical characteristics, chemical characteristics, biological characteristics, and radioactivity. The water quality objectives from the Ocean Plan are incorporated as receiving water limitations into this Order. In addition, Table 1 of the Ocean Plan contains numeric water quality objectives for 83 toxic pollutants for the protection of marine aquatic life and human health. Pursuant to NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1), and in accordance with procedures established by the Ocean Plan (2005), the Central Coast Water Board has performed a reasonable potential analysis (RPA) to determine the need for effluent limitations for the Table 1 toxic pollutants.

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

Procedures for performing an (RPA for ocean dischargers are described in Section III.C and Appendix VI of the Ocean Plan. The procedure is a statistical method that projects an effluent data set while taking into account the averaging period of WQOs, the long term variability of pollutants in the effluent, limitations associated with sparse data sets, and uncertainty associated with censored data sets. The procedure assumes a lognormal distribution of the effluent data set, and compares the 95th percentile concentration at 95 percent confidence of each Table 1 pollutant, accounting for dilution, to the applicable water quality criterion. The RPA results in one of three following endpoints.

Endpoint 1 – There is “reasonable potential.” An effluent limitation must be developed for the pollutant. Effluent monitoring for the pollutant, consistent with the monitoring frequency in Appendix III (Ocean Plan), is required.

Endpoint 2 - There is no “reasonable potential.” An effluent limitation is not required for the pollutant. Appendix III (Ocean Plan) effluent monitoring is not required for the pollutant; the Regional Board, however, may require occasional monitoring for the pollutant or for whole effluent toxicity as appropriate.

Endpoint 3 - The RPA is inconclusive. Monitoring for the pollutant or whole effluent toxicity testing, consistent with the monitoring frequency in Appendix III (Ocean Plan), is required. An existing effluent limitation for the pollutant shall remain in the permit, otherwise the permit shall include a reopener clause to allow for subsequent modification of the permit to include an effluent limitation if the monitoring establishes that the discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above a Table 1 water quality objective.

The State Water Board has developed a reasonable potential calculator (RPcalc 2.0), which is available at:

http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/docs/trirev/stakeholder0505_05/rpcalc20_setup.exe

RPcalc 2.0 was used in the development of this Order and considers several pathways in the determination of reasonable potential.

a. First Path

If available information about the receiving water or the discharge supports a finding of reasonable potential without analysis of effluent data, the Central Coast Water Board may decide that WQBELs are necessary after a review of such information. Such information may include: the facility or discharge type, solids loading, lack of dilution, history of compliance problems, potential toxic effects, fish tissue data, §303(d) status of the receiving water, or the presence of threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat, or other information.

b. Second Path

If any pollutant concentration, adjusted to account for dilution, is greater than the most stringent applicable water quality objective, there is reasonable potential for that pollutant.

c. Third Path

If the effluent data contain 3 or more detected and quantified values (i.e., values that are at or above the minimum level (ML)), and all values in the data set are at or above the ML, a parametric RPA is conducted to project the range of possible effluent values. The 95th percentile concentration is determined at 95 percent confidence for each pollutant, and compared to the most stringent applicable water quality objective to determine reasonable potential. A parametric analysis assumes that the range of possible effluent values is distributed lognormally. If the 95th percentile value is greater than the most stringent applicable water quality objective, there is reasonable potential for that pollutant.

d. Fourth Path

If the effluent data contain 3 or more detected and quantified values (i.e., values that are at or above the ML), but at least one value in the data set is less than the ML, a parametric RPA is conducted according to the following steps.

Table F-8. RPA Results for Discharges to Monterey Bay

Table 1 Pollutant	Most Stringent WQO (µg/L)	No. of Samples	No. of Non-Detects	Max Effluent Conc. (µg/L)	RPA Result, Comment
-------------------	---------------------------	----------------	--------------------	---------------------------	---------------------

Objectives for Protection of Marine Aquatic Life					
Ammonia (as N)	600	39	0	249	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Arsenic	8	8	3	3.0	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Cadmium	1	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Chlorinated Phenolics	1	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Chromium (VI)	2	18	0	0.89	Endpoint 1 – Effluent limitation is necessary.
Copper	3	8	3	2.1	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Cyanide	1	8	0	0.40	Endpoint 1 – Effluent limitation is necessary.
Endosulfan (total)	0.009	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Endrin	0.002	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
HCH	0.004	8	7	0.00023	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Lead	2	8	7	0.0034	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Mercury	0.04	8	3	0.0060	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Nickel	5	8	3	0.024	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Non-chlorinated Phenolics	30	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Selenium	15	8	0	0.39	Endpoint 1 – Effluent limitation is necessary.
Silver	0.7	8	8	0.16	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Total Residual Chlorine	2	21	19	3.2	Endpoint 1 – Effluent limitation is necessary.
Zinc	20	8	3	8.1	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Objectives for Protection of Human Health - Noncarcinogens					
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	540000	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
2,4-Dinitrophenol	4.0	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
2-Methyl-4,6-Dinitrophenol	220	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Acrolein	220	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.

Antimony	1200	8	7	0.0045	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	4.4	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	1200	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Chlorobenzene	570	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Chromium (III)	190000	8	1	0.60	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Dichlorobenzenes	5100	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Diethyl Phthalate	33000	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Dimethyl Phthalate	820000	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	3500	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Ethylbenzene	4100	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Fluoranthene	15	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Hexachlorocyclo-pentadiene	58	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Nitrobenzene	4.9	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Thallium	2	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Toluene	85000	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Tributyltin	0.0014	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Objectives for Protection of Human Health - Carcinogens					
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	2.3	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	9.4	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
1,1-Dichloroethylene	0.9	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
1,2-Dichloroethane	28	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.

1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	0.16	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
1,3-Dichloropropylene	8.9	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	18	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
TCDD Equivalents	3.9×10^{-9}	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	0.29	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	2.6	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	0.0081	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Acrylonitrile	0.10	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Aldrin	2.2×10^{-5}	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Benzene	5.9	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Benzidine	6.9×10^{-5}	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Beryllium	0.033	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	0.045	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	3.5	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.90	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Chlordane	2.3×10^{-5}	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Chlorodibromomethane	8.6	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Chloroform	130	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
DDT (total)	0.00017	18	17	0.00068	Endpoint 2 – Effluent limitation not required.
Dichlorobromomethane	6.2	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.

Dieldrin	0.00004	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Halomethanes	130	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Heptachlor	0.00005	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Heptachlor Epoxide	0.00002	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Hexachlorobenzene	0.00021	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Hexachlorobutadiene	14	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Hexachloroethane	2.5	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Isophorone	730	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Methylene Chloride	450	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	7.3	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	0.38	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	2.5	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
PAHs (total)	0.0088	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
PCBs	1.9×10^{-5}	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Tetrachloroethylene	2.0	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Toxaphene	0.00021	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Trichloroethylene	27	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.
Vinyl Chloride	36	8	8	ND	Endpoint 3 – RPA is inconclusive. Less than 3 detects or greater than 80% ND.

- (1) If the number of censored values (those expressed as a “less than” value) account for less than 80 percent of the total number of effluent values, calculate the M_L (the mean of the natural log of transformed data) and S_L (the standard deviation of the natural log of transformed data) and conduct a parametric RPA, as described above for the Third Path.

- (2) If the number of censored values account for 80 percent or more of the total number of effluent values, conduct a non-parametric RPA, as described below for the Fifth Path. (A non-parametric analysis becomes necessary when the effluent data are limited, and no assumptions can be made regarding its possible distribution.)

e. Fifth Path

A non-parametric RPA is conducted when the effluent data set contains less than 3 detected and quantified values, or when the effluent data set contains 3 or more detected and quantified values but the number of censored values accounts for 80 percent or more of the total number of effluent values. A non-parametric analysis is conducted by ordering the data, comparing each result to the applicable water quality objective, and accounting for ties. The sample number is reduced by one for each tie, when the dilution-adjusted method detection limit (MDL) is greater than the water quality objective. If the adjusted sample number, after accounting for ties, is greater than 15, the pollutant has no reasonable potential to exceed the water quality objective. If the sample number is 15 or less, the RPA is inconclusive, monitoring is required, and any existing effluent limits in the expiring permit are retained.

An RPA was conducted using effluent data reported from monitoring events from July 2008 to November 2012. The effluent data was obtained from eSMR data posted to CIWQS and from DMR data posted to ICIS for Monitoring Location EFF-001, which represents flow-weighted concentrations based on each flow stream contribution (i.e., brine wastes and secondary effluent). The following tables present results of the RPA, performed in accordance with procedures described by the Ocean Plan for the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Regional Treatment Plant. The maximum effluent concentration adjusted for complete mixing, the applicable WQO, and the RPA endpoint for each Table 1 pollutant is identified. As shown in the following tables, the RPA commonly lead to Endpoint 3, meaning that the RPA is inconclusive, when a majority of the effluent data is reported as ND (not detected). In these circumstances, the Central Coast Water Board concludes that additional monitoring will be required for those pollutants during the term of the reissued permit and existing effluent limits will be retained.

4. WQBEL Calculations

Based on results of the RPA, performed in accordance with methods of the Ocean Plan for discharges to the Pacific Ocean, the Central Coast Water Board is establishing WQBELs for chromium (VI), cyanide, selenium, and total residual chlorine based on a conclusion of Endpoint 1. An Endpoint 2 was concluded for ammonia, arsenic, chromium (III), copper, mercury, nickel, zinc, and DDT (total). Effluent limits are not required for pollutants resulting in an Endpoint 2. All other Ocean Plan Table 1 pollutants resulted in an Endpoint 3; therefore, the limits for these pollutants are retained in this Order. The Regional Water Board is also

establishing WQBELs for whole effluent, acute and chronic toxicity, which are also pollutants or pollutant parameters identified by Table 1 of the Ocean Plan, based on information about the receiving water and/or the discharge instead of characterization of effluent monitoring data.

As described by Section III. C of the Ocean Plan, effluent limits for Table 1 pollutants are calculated according to the following equation.

$$C_e = C_o + D_m (C_o - C_s)$$

Where ...

C_e = the effluent limitation ($\mu\text{g/L}$)

C_o = the concentration (the water quality objective) to be met at the completion of initial dilution ($\mu\text{g/L}$).

C_s = background seawater concentration ($\mu\text{g/L}$)

D_m = minimum probable initial dilution expressed as parts seawater per part wastewater (here, $D_m = 145$)

For the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, the D_m of 145 is unchanged from Order No. R3-2008-0008. Initial dilution is the process that results in the rapid and irreversible turbulent mixing of wastewater with ocean water around the point of discharge. As site-specific water quality data are not available, in accordance with Table 1 implementing procedures, C_s equals zero for all pollutants, except the following.

Table F-9. Background Concentrations (C_s) - Ocean Plan (Table 3)

Pollutant	Background Seawater Concentration
Arsenic	3 $\mu\text{g/L}$
Copper	2 $\mu\text{g/L}$
Mercury	0.0005 $\mu\text{g/L}$
Silver	0.16 $\mu\text{g/L}$
Zinc	8 $\mu\text{g/L}$

For all other Table 1 parameters, $C_s=0$

Applicable water quality objectives from Table 1 of the Ocean Plan are as follows.

**Table F-10. Water Quality Objectives (C_o)–Ocean Plan (Table 1)
Objectives for Protection of Marine Aquatic Life**

Pollutant	Units	6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum
Arsenic	$\mu\text{g/L}$	8	32	80
Cadmium	$\mu\text{g/L}$	1	4	10
Chromium (VI)	$\mu\text{g/L}$	2	8	20
Copper	$\mu\text{g/L}$	3	12	30

Pollutant	Units	6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum
Lead	µg/L	2	8	20
Mercury	µg/L	0.04	0.16	0.4
Nickel	µg/L	5	20	50
Selenium	µg/L	15	60	150
Silver	µg/L	0.7	2.8	7
Zinc	µg/L	20	80	200
Cyanide	µg/L	1	4	10
Total Chlorine Residual	µg/L	2	8	60
Ammonia	µg/L	600	2400	6000
Acute Toxicity	TUa	-----	0.3	-----
Chronic Toxicity	TUc	-----	1	-----
Non-chlorinated Phenolics	µg/L	30	120	300
Chlorinated Phenolics	µg/L	1	4	10
Endosulfan (total)	µg/L	0.009	0.018	0.027
Endrin	µg/L	0.002	0.004	0.006
HCH	µg/L	0.004	0.008	0.012
Radioactivity	µg/L	-----	-----	-----

Table F-11. Water Quality Objectives (Co)–Ocean Plan (Table 1) Objectives for Protection of Human Health – (Non-Carcinogens)

Pollutant	Units	30-day Average
Acrolein	µg/L	220
Antimony	µg/L	1200
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	µg/L	4.4
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	µg/L	1200
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	570
Chromium (III)	µg/L	190,000
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	3500
Dichlorobenzenes	µg/L	5100
Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	33000
Dimethyl Phthalate	µg/L	820,000
2-Methyl-4,6-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	220
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	4
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	4100
Fluoranthene	µg/L	15
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	58
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	4.9
Thallium	µg/L	2
Toluene	µg/L	85,000
Tributyltin	µg/L	0.0014
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	540,000

Table F-12. Water Quality Objectives (Co)–Ocean Plan (Table 1) Objectives for Protection of Human Health – (Carcinogens)

Pollutant	Units	30-day Average
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	0.1
Aldrin	µg/L	0.000022
Benzene	µg/L	5.9
Benzidine	µg/L	0.000069
Beryllium	µg/L	0.033
Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	µg/L	0.045
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	µg/L	3.5
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	0.9
Chlordane	µg/L	0.000023
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	8.6
Chloroform	µg/L	130
DDT (total)	µg/L	0.00017
1,4 Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	18
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	0.0081
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	28
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	0.9
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	6.2
Methylene Chloride	µg/L	450
1,3-Dichloropropylene	µg/L	8.9
Dieldrin	µg/L	0.00004
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	2.6
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	0.16
Halomethanes	µg/L	130
Heptachlor	µg/L	0.00005
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	0.00002
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	0.00021
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	14
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	2.5
Isophorone	µg/L	730
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	7.3
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	µg/L	0.38
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	2.5
PAHs (total)	µg/L	0.0088
PCBs	µg/L	0.000019
TCDD Equivalent	µg/L	0.0000000039
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	2.3
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	2
Toxaphene	µg/L	0.00021
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	27
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	9.4
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	0.29
Vinyl Chloride	µg/L	36

Effluent limits are calculated using the equation $C_e = C_o + D_m (C_o - C_s)$ as outlined above. As an example, effluent limitations are calculated as follows for total residual chlorine, chronic toxicity, and acute toxicity.

Total Residual Chlorine

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_e &= 2 + 145 (2 - 0) = && 292 \mu\text{g/L (6-Month Median)} \\
 C_e &= 8 + 145 (8 - 0) = && 1,168 \mu\text{g/L (Daily Maximum)} \\
 C_e &= 60 + 145 (60 - 0) = && 8,760 \text{ (Instantaneous Maximum)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Chronic Toxicity

$$C_e = 1 + 145 (1 - 0) = 146 \text{ TUc (Daily Maximum)}$$

Acute Toxicity

To determine an effluent limitation for acute toxicity, the Ocean Plan allows a mixing zone that is ten percent of the distance from the edge of the outfall structure to the edge of the chronic mixing zone (the zone of initial dilution); and therefore, the effluent limitation for acute toxicity is determined by the following equation:

$$C_e = C_o + (0.1) D_m (C_o)$$

Where C_o equals 0.3 and D_m equals 145, the effluent limitation for acute toxicity is 4.7 TUa.

Mass Based Effluent Limitations

Implementing provisions at Section III. C of the Ocean Plan require that, in addition to concentration-based limits, effluent limitations for Table 1 pollutants be expressed in terms of mass. Therefore, the Order includes mass-based limits based on a flow rate of 29.6 MGD.

Significant Figures

For consistency purposes, all limits calculated are expressed with two significant digits.

Table F-13. Effluent Limitations for the Protection of Marine Aquatic Life

Pollutant	Unit	6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum
Cadmium	µg/L	150	580	1,500
	lb/day ^[1]	36	140	360
Chromium (Hexavalent) ^[2]	µg/L	290	1,200	2,900
	lb/day ^[1]	72	290	720
Lead	µg/L	290	1,200	2,900
	lb/day ^[1]	72	290	720
Selenium	µg/L	2,200	8,800	22,000
	lb/day ^[1]	540	2,200	5,400
Silver	µg/L	79	390	1,000
	lb/day ^[1]	20	95	250

Pollutant	Unit	6-Month Median	Daily Maximum	Instantaneous Maximum
Cyanide ^[3]	µg/L	150	580	1,500
	lb/day ^[1]	36	140	360
Total Residual Chlorine ^[4]	µg/L	290	1,200	8,800
	lb/day ^[1]	72	290	2,200
Acute Toxicity ^[5]	TUa	---	4.7	---
Chronic Toxicity ^[5]	TUc	---	150	---
Phenolic Compounds (non-chlorinated)	µg/L	4,400	18,000	44,000
	lb/day ^[1]	1,100	4,300	11,000
Endosulfan	µg/L	1.3	2.6	3.9
	lb/day ^[1]	0.32	0.65	0.97
Endrin	µg/L	0.29	0.58	0.88
	lb/day ^[1]	0.072	0.14	0.22
HCH	µg/L	0.58	1.2	1.8
	lb/day ^[1]	0.14	0.29	0.43
Radioactivity	--	Not to exceed limits specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15, Article 5, Section 64443		

^[1] Mass limitations are based on 29.6 MGD maximum effluent flow.

^[2] The Discharger may at their option meet this objective as a total chromium objective.

^[3] If a discharger can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Regional Board (subject to EPA approval) that an analytical method is available to reliably distinguish between strongly and weakly complexed cyanide, effluent limitations for cyanide may be met by the combined measurement of free cyanide, simple alkali metal cyanides, and weakly complexed organometallic cyanide complexes. In order for the analytical method to be acceptable, the recovery of free cyanide from metal complexes must be comparable to that achieved by the approved method in 40 CFR PART 136, as revised May 14, 1999.

^[4] Water quality objectives for total chlorine residual applying to intermittent discharges not exceeding two hours shall be determined using the following equation:

$\log_y = -0.43(\log_x) + 1.8$ where: y = the water quality objective (in µg/L) to apply when chlorine is being discharged; and x = the duration of uninterrupted chlorine discharge in minutes.

The applicable effluent limitation must then be determined using Equation No. 1 from the Ocean Plan.

^[5] See Attachment A for applicable definitions.

Table F-14. Effluent Limitations for the Protection of Human Health (Non-Carcinogens)

Pollutant	Unit	30-day Average
Acrolein	µg/L	32,000
	lb/day ^[1]	7,900
Antimony	µg/L	180,000
	lb/day ^[1]	43,000
Bis(2-Chloroethoxy)Methane	µg/L	640
	lb/day ^[1]	160
Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)Ether	µg/L	180,000
	lb/day ^[1]	43,000
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	83,000
	lb/day ^[1]	21,000
Di-n-Butyl Phthalate	µg/L	510,000
	lb/day ^[1]	130,000
Dichlorobenzenes	µg/L	740,000

Pollutant	Unit	30-day Average
	lb/day ^[1]	180,000
Diethyl Phthalate	µg/L	4,800,000
	lb/day ^[1]	1,200,000
Dimethyl Phthalate	µg/L	120,000,000
	lb/day ^[1]	30,000,000
2-Methyl-4,6-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	32,000
	lb/day ^[1]	7,900
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	580
	lb/day ^[1]	140
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	600,000
	lb/day ^[1]	150,000
Fluoranthene	µg/L	2,200
	lb/day ^[1]	540
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	8,500
	lb/day ^[1]	2,100
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	720
	lb/day ^[1]	180
Thallium	µg/L	290
	lb/day ^[1]	72
Toluene	µg/L	12,000,000
	lb/day ^[1]	3,100,000
Tributyltin	µg/L	0.20
	lb/day ^[1]	0.050
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	79,000,000
	lb/day ^[1]	19,000,000

^[1] Mass limitations are based on 29.6 MGD maximum effluent flow.

Table F-15. Effluent Limitations for the Protection of Human Health (Carcinogens)

Pollutant	Unit	30-day Average
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	15
	lb/day ^[1]	3.6
Aldrin	µg/L	0.0032
	lb/day ^[1]	0.00079
Benzene	µg/L	860
	lb/day ^[1]	210
Benzidine	µg/L	0.010
	lb/day ^[1]	0.0025
Beryllium	µg/L	4.8
	lb/day ^[1]	1.2
Bis(2-Chloroethyl)Ether	µg/L	6.6
	lb/day ^[1]	1.6
Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)Phthalate	µg/L	510
	lb/day ^[1]	130
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	130

Pollutant	Unit	30-day Average
	lb/day ^[1]	32
Chlordane	µg/L	0.0034
	lb/day ^[1]	0.00083
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	1,300
	lb/day ^[1]	310
Chloroform	µg/L	19,000
	lb/day ^[1]	4,700
1,4 Dichlorobenzene	µg/L	2,600
	lb/day ^[1]	650
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	1.2
	lb/day ^[1]	0.29
1,2-Dichloroethane	µg/L	4,100
	lb/day ^[1]	1,000
1,1-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	130
	lb/day ^[1]	32
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	910
	lb/day ^[1]	220
Dichloromethane (Methylene Chloride)	µg/L	66,000
	lb/day ^[1]	16,000
1,3-Dichloropropene	µg/L	1,300
	lb/day ^[1]	320
Dieldrin	µg/L	0.0058
	lb/day ^[1]	0.0014
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	380
	lb/day ^[1]	94
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	23
	lb/day ^[1]	5.8
Halomethanes	µg/L	19,000
	lb/day ^[1]	4,700
Heptachlor	µg/L	0.0073
	lb/day ^[1]	0.0018
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	0.0029
	lb/day ^[1]	0.00072
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	0.031
	lb/day ^[1]	0.0076
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	2,000
	lb/day ^[1]	500
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	370
	lb/day ^[1]	90
Isophorone	µg/L	110,000
	lb/day ^[1]	26,000
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	1,100
	lb/day ^[1]	260
N-Nitrosodi-n-Propylamine	µg/L	55

Pollutant	Unit	30-day Average
	lb/day ^[1]	14
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	370
	lb/day ^[1]	90
PAHs (total)	µg/L	1.3
	lb/day ^[1]	0.32
PCBs	µg/L	0.0028
	lb/day ^[1]	0.00068
TCDD Equivalents	µg/L	5.7E-07
	lb/day ^[1]	1.4E-07
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	µg/L	340
	lb/day ^[1]	83
Tetrachloroethylene	µg/L	290
	lb/day ^[1]	72
Toxaphene	µg/L	0.031
	lb/day ^[1]	0.0076
Trichloroethylene	µg/L	3,900
	lb/day ^[1]	970
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	1,400
	lb/day ^[1]	340
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	42
	lb/day ^[1]	10
Vinyl Chloride	µg/L	5,300
	lb/day ^[1]	1,300

^[1] Mass limitations are based on 29.6 MGD maximum effluent flow.

5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

Whole effluent toxicity (WET) limitations protect receiving water quality from the aggregate toxic effect of a mixture of pollutants in the effluent. WET tests measure the degree of response of exposed aquatic test organisms to an effluent. The WET approach allows for protection of the narrative “no toxics in toxic amounts” criterion while implementing numeric criteria for toxicity. There are two types of WET tests - acute and chronic. An acute toxicity test is conducted over a short time period and measures mortality. A chronic toxicity test is conducted over a longer period of time and may measure mortality, reproduction, and growth.

The Central Coast Water Board has retained acute and chronic toxicity limitations from the previous permit. Further, the effluent limitations have been calculated based on a minimum probable initial dilution of 145 to 1.

The Discharger must also maintain a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) Workplan, which describes steps that the Discharger intends to follow in the event that acute and/or chronic toxicity limitations are exceeded. When monitoring measures WET in the effluent above the limitations established by the Order, the Discharger must

resample, if the discharge is continuing, and retest. The Executive Officer will then determine whether to initiate enforcement action, whether to require the Discharger to implement a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation, or to implement other measures.

D. Final Effluent Limitations

Final, technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations established by the Order are discussed in the preceding sections of the Fact Sheet.

1. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The Order retains effluent limitations established by the previous permit for BOD₅, CBOD₅, TSS, oil and grease, settleable solids, turbidity, pH, total coliform, fecal coliform, enterococcus bacteria, total residual chlorine, acute toxicity and chronic toxicity. All WQBELs for Ocean Plan Table 1 pollutants were retained except for those for arsenic, copper, mercury, nickel, zinc, ammonia, chromium (III), and DDT based on results of the RPA as outlined in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

The Ocean Plan was amended in 2005 to include a procedure for determining “reasonable potential” by characterization of effluent monitoring data. A RPA, using the updated Ocean Plan procedure, resulted in “no reasonable potential” (endpoint 2) for arsenic, copper, mercury, nickel, zinc, ammonia, chromium (III), and DDT.

Elimination of WQBELs for Table 1 pollutants is consistent with the exception to the CWA’s anti-backsliding requirements expressed at section 402(o)(2)(B)(i) of the Act, which allows a reissued permit to include less stringent limitations when “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.” In these circumstances, less stringent limitations (the elimination of limitations per the RPA) are based on new data, which were generated during the term of the previous permit, and which demonstrate no reasonable potential for discharges from the Facility to cause or contribute to exceedances of applicable water quality standards for arsenic, copper, mercury, nickel, zinc, ammonia, chromium (III), and DDT.

Consequently, the Order does not contain effluent limitations or prohibitions that are less stringent than the previous permit and is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements.

2. Satisfaction of Antidegradation Policy

The Order does not authorize increases in discharge rates or pollutant loadings, and its limitations and conditions otherwise assure maintenance of the existing quality of receiving waters. Therefore, provisions of the Order are consistent with applicable anti-degradation policy expressed by NPDES regulations at 40 CFR 131.12 and by State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

3. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on CBOD₅; TSS; settleable solids; turbidity; oil and grease; and pH. Restrictions on these pollutants are discussed in section IV. B of the Fact Sheet. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards. These limitations are not more stringent than required by the CWA.

Final technology and water quality-based effluent limitations are summarized in sections IV. B and C of this Fact Sheet.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations

The Order does not establish interim effluent limitations and schedules for compliance with final limitations. Interim limitations are authorized only in certain circumstances, when immediate compliance with newly established final water quality based limitations is not feasible.

F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

G. Reclamation Specifications – Not Applicable

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water

Receiving water quality is a result of many factors, some unrelated to the discharge. This Order considers these factors and is designed to minimize the influence of the discharge on the receiving water. Receiving water limitations within the proposed Order include the receiving water limitations of the previous Order.

B. Groundwater

Groundwater limitations established by the Order include general objectives for ground water established by the Basin Plan for the Central Coast Region.

VI. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Coast Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. Rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), which is presented as Attachment E of this Order, is presented below.

A. Influent Monitoring

In addition to influent flow monitoring, influent monitoring for BOD₅ and TSS is required to determine compliance with the Order's 85 percent removal requirement for those pollutants.

B. Effluent Monitoring

Effluent monitoring requirements of the previous permit for Discharge Point 001 (the Ocean outfall) are retained in this Order.

Current Monitoring Protocol. The Discharger's outfall and brine discharge facilities currently do not allow for aggregate flow metering or sampling of as-discharged combined secondary effluent and brine wastes at high secondary effluent flows (during wet season when recycling is not being implemented) above what is required for blending to safely meet the prescribed effluent limitations. Brine wastes are stored in a holding pond and are discharged from the holding pond through a structure that allows for mixing brine wastes with secondary effluent. During the dry season, when the Discharger is recycling essentially 100% of the wastewater flow less what is needed for blending with brine wastes, the Facility is capable of aggregate flow metering and sampling downstream of a static mixer prior to entering the outfall. During the dry season, brine waste discharge flows (with minimum required secondary effluent blending) and high volume secondary effluent flows are currently metered separately and are sampled separately via grab samples that are manually composited based on the as-discharged flow proportions entering the outfall. Effluent monitoring per the Discharger's current facility configuration and effluent monitoring protocol is acceptable until the brine waste disposal facility is upgraded to handle anticipated increases in brine flows and facilitate year-round blended secondary effluent and brine waste flow metering and sampling (see Special Provision c. within section V.C.2 of the Order).

Wastewater monitored at Monitoring Location EFF-001 is a combination of brine wastes and secondary effluent. Effluent monitoring data that are reported for compliance purposes represent flow-weighted concentrations based on each flow stream contribution, which ensures a representative sample of effluent discharged from the Regional Treatment Plant.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

Whole effluent toxicity (WET) limitations protect receiving water quality from the aggregate toxic effect of a mixture of pollutants in the effluent. Acute toxicity testing measures mortality in 100 percent effluent over a short test period and chronic toxicity testing is conducted over a longer period of time and may measure mortality, reproduction, and/or growth. This Order retains acute and chronic WET limitations and monitoring requirements from the previous permit for Discharge Point 001.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring

1. Surface Water Monitoring

The Order retains the surface water receiving water monitoring from the previous permit.

2. Groundwater

Groundwater monitoring requirements are not established by the Order.

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Biosolids/Sludge Monitoring.

Biosolids monitoring requirements are retained from the previous Order.

2. Pretreatment Monitoring.

This Order retains the requirements of the previous permit to conduct pretreatment monitoring and reporting.

3. Outfall Inspection.

This Order retains the requirement of the previous permit to conduct annual, visual inspections (including dye tracer tests) of the outfall structure and report to the Central Coast Water Board regarding its physical integrity.

4. MBNMS Spill Reporting.

This Order retains the requirement of the previous permit to report all sewage spills under its control that are likely to enter ocean waters, directly to the MBNMS office.

VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 122.42, are provided in Attachment D to the Order.

NPDES regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 122.41 (a) (1) and (b - n) establish conditions that apply to all state-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. 40 C.F.R. § 123.25 (a) (12) allows the State to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 C.F.R. § 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

The Order may be modified in accordance with the requirements set forth at 40 C.F.R. parts 122 and 124, to include appropriate conditions or limits based on newly available information, or to implement any, new State water quality objectives that are approved by the U.S. EPA. As effluent is further characterized through additional monitoring, and if a need for additional effluent limitations becomes apparent after additional effluent characterization, the Order will be reopened to incorporate such limitations.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. Toxicity Reduction Requirements

The requirement to maintain a Toxicity Reduction Work Plan is retained from Order No. R3-2008-0008. When toxicity monitoring measures acute or chronic toxicity in the effluent above the limitation established by the Order, the Discharger is required to resample and retest, if the discharge is continuing. When all monitoring results are available, the Executive Officer can determine whether to initiate enforcement action, whether to require the Discharger to implement toxicity reduction evaluation (TRE) requirements, or whether other measures are warranted.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

a. Pollutant Minimization Program

The 2012 California Ocean Plan establishes guidelines for the Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP). At the time of the proposed adoption of this Order no known evidence was available that would require the Discharger to immediately develop and conduct a PMP. The Central Coast Water Board will notify the Discharger in writing if such a program becomes necessary.

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

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. Biosolids Management

Provisions regarding sludge handling and disposal ensure that such activity will comply with all applicable regulations.

40 C.F.R. part 503 sets forth U.S. EPA's final rule for the use and disposal of biosolids, or sewage sludge, and governs the final use or disposal of biosolids. The intent of this federal program is to ensure that sewage sludge is used or disposed of in a way that protects both human health and the environment.

U.S. EPA's regulations require that producers of sewage sludge meet certain reporting, handling, and disposal requirements. As the U.S. EPA has not delegated the authority to implement the sludge program to the State of California, the enforcement of sludge requirements that apply to the Discharger remains under U.S. EPA's jurisdiction at this time. U.S. EPA, not the Central Coast Water Board, will oversee compliance with 40 C.F.R. part 503.

40 C.F.R. § 503.4 (Relationship to other regulations) states that the disposal of sewage sludge in a municipal solid waste landfill unit, as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 258.2, that complies with the requirements in 40 C.F.R. part 258 constitutes compliance with section 405 (d) of the CWA. Any person who prepares sewage sludge that is disposed in a municipal solid waste landfill unit must ensure that the sewage sludge meets the applicable requirements of 40 C.F.R. part 503.

6. Other Special Provisions

a. Discharges of Storm Water

The Order does not address discharges of storm water from the treatment and disposal site, except to require coverage by and compliance with applicable provisions of General Permit No. CAS000001 - *Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Industrial Activities*.

b. Sanitary Sewer System Requirements

The Order requires coverage by and compliance with applicable provisions of General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems (State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ). This General Permit, adopted on May 2, 2006, is applicable to all "federal and state agencies, municipalities, counties, districts, and other public entities that own or operate sanitary sewer systems greater than one mile in length that collect and/or convey untreated or partially treated wastewater to a publicly owned treatment facility in the State of California." The purpose of the General Permit is to promote the proper and efficient management, operation, and maintenance of sanitary sewer systems and to minimize the occurrences and impacts of sanitary sewer overflows.

7. Compliance Schedules

The Order does not establish interim effluent limitations and schedules of compliance with final limitations.

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Central Coast Water Board is considering the issuance of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that will serve as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency Regional Treatment Plant. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Central Coast Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs. The Central Coast Water Board encourages public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Central Coast Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for the discharge and provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through **posting in the Salinas Californian on February 26, 2014.**

B. Written Comments

Staff received three written comments from the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary on February 27, 2014. Those comments are summarized, along with staff's response to the comments, as follows:

1. The MBNMS requested that MRWPCA send annual reports and the brine waste disposal study to the MBNMS office.

Staff Response: Requirements for MRWPCA to send annual reports and the brine waste disposal study to the MBNMS office are included on pages D-14 and 14, respectively.

2. The MBNMS requested improvements to the map on page B-1.

Staff Response: Improvements were made to the map on page B-1.

3. The MBNMS requested that MRWPCA immediately notify the MBNMS office in the event spills enter ocean waters.

Staff Response: A requirement for MRWPCA to notify the MBNMS office in the event spills enter ocean waters is included on page E-18.

Staff received written comments from the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, via correspondence dated March 21, 2014. Those comments are summarized, along with staff's response to the comments, as follows:

1. Page 1, Table 1. Discharger Information: include mailing address: 5 Harris Court, Building D, Monterey, CA 93940.

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. This information is contained in the fact sheet, Table F-1.

2. Page 1, Table 2. Include a footnote that the termination of the MRWPCA Outfall is outside the National Marine Sanctuary Zone of Prohibition.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

3. Page 3, MRWPCA recommends including a Facility Information Section within the Order and the addition of the previous Table 4. See Below:

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

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

Table 4. Facility Information

Discharger	Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency
Name of Facility	Regional Treatment Plant
Facility Address	14811 Del Monte Blvd
	Marina, CA 93933
	Monterey County
Facility Contact, Title, and Phone	James Dix, Operations Manager, (831) 883-6183
Environmental Contact	Garrett Haertel, Compliance Engineer, (831) 883-6176
Mailing Address	MRWPCA, 5 Harris Court, Bldg D, Monterey, CA 93940
Type of Facility	POTW
Facility Design Flows	
Average dry weather flow ^[1]	29.6 million gallons per day (MGD)
Peak wet weather flow ^[1]	75.6 MGD
Ultimate wet weather flow ^[2]	81.2 MGD

^[1] Treatment system

^[2] Ocean outfall

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. This information is contained in the fact sheet, Table F-1.

4. Page 3. MRWPCA also recommends reestablishing the “Background” and “Facility Description” Sections under the Findings Heading. From the previous permit:

A. Background. *The Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) is currently discharging pursuant to Order No. R3-2008-0008 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No.CA0048551. The Discharger submitted a Report of Waste Discharge, dated November 21, 2012, and applied for an NPDES permit renewal to discharge up to 29.6 MGD average dry weather flow of treated wastewater from the MRWPCA’s Regional Treatment Plant. The application was deemed complete on March 15, 2013.*

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

B. Facility Description. *The MRWPCA, which currently serves a population of approximately 252,000, was created in 1972. MRWPCA consists of and provides regional wastewater treatment, disposal and reclamation facilities for the cities of Monterey, Pacific Grove, Del Rey Oaks, Sand City, Marina, and Salinas, the Seaside Sanitation District, the Castroville, Moss Landing and Boronda Community Service Districts, and Fort Ord. Each member entity retains ownership and operating/maintenance responsibility for wastewater collection and transport systems up to the point of connection with interceptors owned and operated by the Discharger. Residential, commercial, and industrial wastewater is conveyed to the MRWPCA Regional Treatment Plant. The plant has an average dry weather design treatment capacity of 29.6 MGD and a peak wet weather design capacity of 75.6 MGD. The facility began operation in 1990, replacing six local wastewater treatment facilities.*

In winter months, secondary treated wastewater from the Regional Treatment Plant is discharged through a diffuser, positioned 11,260 feet offshore at a depth of approximately 100 feet, to Monterey Bay. The diffuser was designed to convey ultimate wet weather flows of 81.2 MGD. In summer months, treated wastewater is recycled for irrigation of 12,000 acres of farmland in the northern Salinas Valley. Tertiary treatment of recycled wastewater is provided for design flows of up to 29.6 MGD by the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project (SVRP), which holds tertiary treated wastewater in an 80 acre-foot storage pond before it is distributed to farmland by the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP). The irrigation use of recycled wastewater reduces regional dependence on and use of local groundwater, thereby minimizing saltwater intrusion.

Wastewater treatment at the Regional Treatment Plant includes aerated grit removal, primary clarifiers, trickling filters, solids contact, secondary clarifiers, and filtration. Undisinfected secondary clarifier effluent is discharged through Discharge Point 001. Sludge removed from primary and secondary treatment is thickened using dissolved air floatation and gravity thickeners. It is then pumped to anaerobic digesters where organic matter is consumed and the sludge volume is reduced. The sludge drying beds and belt filter press have been replaced with a Biosolids Dewatering Facility constructed in 2007, utilizing two very large screw presses. The current capacity of the Biosolids Facility is 19.8 dry tons per day (dtpd) at 25% solids content. A significant advantage of the new facility is that it produces biosolids cake 24 hours per day and seven days per week in any weather condition. The holding lagoons and some of the drying beds may still be utilized for emergency storage in case the screw presses require a shut down. The biosolids cake is currently being hauled to the adjacent landfill, where it is mixed with wood products and used for slope cover.

Because irrigation uses of recycled wastewater are sensitive to elevated levels of total dissolved solids (TDS), the MRWPCA has recently sought to keep such elevated TDS wastewaters segregated from the influent flow of the Regional Treatment Plant. Such wastewaters include softener regenerant wastes, groundwater nitrate removal brines and reverse osmosis brines, which are now trucked to the Regional Treatment Plant instead of being discharged to the collection system. The MRWPCA currently accepts 30,000 – 50,000 gallons per day of brine wastes by truck from business entities which

would otherwise be discharging to the sanitary sewer system. Brine wastes are currently held in a 375,000 gallon, lined holding pond at the Regional Treatment Plant and ultimately discharged directly or blended with secondary treated wastewater before being discharged through Discharge Point 001.

MRWPCA feels the inclusion of this language helps explain the complicated systems employed at our facility. Additionally, if this language and sections are added the lettering sequence will need to be updated.

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. This information is contained in the Fact sheet, section II.A.

5. Page 4, II, Discharge Prohibition A. Modify as follows: “Discharge of ~~treated wastewater~~ to the Pacific Ocean...” MRWPCA currently accepts and discharges wastes not classified as treated wastewater. These programs help improve water quality in the basin and all discharges to the Ocean are monitored.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

6. Page 9, Table 7, Footnote 1, Change the units for Ce from mg/L to µg/L.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

7. Page 10, III.C., Change the word reclaimed to recycled as this water quality level has been redefined per the permitted use under Order 94-82.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

8. Page 10, IV.A. Surface Water Limitations. We request that the first paragraph be revised as follows: “The discharge shall not cause a violation of the following receiving water limitations, which are based on water quality objectives (Water-Contact Standards) contained in the Ocean Plan and are a required part of this Order. Compliance with these limitations shall be determined from samples collected at stations representative of the area within the waste field where initial dilution is completed except where other sampling stations are defined below.” As an alternative, the language in Section C of the current permit would be acceptable, specifically the opening paragraph and the first sentence following the number 1.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made most of the editorial correction of language consistent with the requirements in the previous Order. Staff has not deleted the phrase “and are a required part of this Order.” Receiving water limitations are required in this Order.

9. Page 13, V.C.2.a, Toxicity Reduction Requirements. One sentence in the last paragraph of this section (starting with “When monitoring measures toxicity in the

effluent...”) is inconsistent with the Ocean Plan. That sentence states that upon an initial failed test and results of subsequent monitoring, “[t]he EO will *determine whether to initiate enforcement action*, whether to require the Discharger to implement a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation, or to *implement other measures*.” However, the Ocean Plan requires the following toxicity implementation requirements to be incorporated into permits: “(1) a requirement to conduct a TRE if the discharge consistently exceeds its toxicity effluent limitation, and (2) a provision requiring a discharger to take all reasonable steps to reduce toxicity once the source of toxicity is identified.” (See Ocean Plan Section III.C.10.b.) Taking enforcement action or requiring implementation of other measures based on the results of toxicity testing, prior to the conduct of a TRE, is inconsistent with the Ocean Plan. It is also inconsistent with the standard toxicity language contained in the State Permit Template. We therefore request that the subject paragraph be modified as follows: *“When monitoring detects effluent toxicity greater than a limitation in this Order, the Discharger shall resample as soon as practicable if the discharge is continuing and retest for whole effluent toxicity. Results of an initial failed test and results of subsequent monitoring shall be reported to the Executive Officer (EO) as soon as possible following receipt of monitoring results. ~~The EO will determine whether to initiate enforcement action, whether to require the discharger to implement a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation, or to implement other measures.~~ If subsequent monitoring indicates that the discharge consistently exceeds a toxicity effluent limit, tThe Discharger, upon notification of the EO, shall conduct a TRE considering guidance provided by the USEPA’s Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Procedures, Phases 1, 2 and 3 (EPA document nos. EPA 600/3-88/034, 600/3-88/035, and 600/3-88/036, respectively). A TRE, if necessary, shall be conducted in accordance with the following schedule.”*

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language which is consistent with the previous Order.

10. Page 14, V.C.2.b. Water-Contact Monitoring (Bacterial Characteristics). This section outlines a monitoring plan for bacteriological monitoring. The plan outlines repeat sampling requirements and frequency. MRWPCA has been granted an exception to normal Water-Contact Monitoring requirements (Samples are normally collected in the surf zone). MRWPCA is allowed to collect its Water-Contact Monitoring samples off-shore due to marine mammals using the beach as a resting area producing high bacterial counts. This off-shore exception requires boat rental, and significant time and resources that other dischargers do not incur. The samples results are also not available within 24 hours of sample collection, which means that based on the “continued daily” requirement, repeat samples should be collected even if the previous sample result is less than the single sample maximum but data is not yet available. MRWPCA recommends the following changes: *“In accordance with Ocean Plan section III.D.1.b., if a single sample exceeds any of the bacteriological single sample maximum (SSM) standards contained within section V.A.1 of this Order, repeat sampling at that location shall be conducted to determine the extent and persistence of the exceedance. The EO should be notified within 24 hours of receiving analytical results and Repeat sampling shall be conducted within 24 hours of receiving*

analytical results and continued ~~daily~~ based on a recommended frequency of the EO until the sample result is less than the SSM standard or until a sanitary survey is conducted to determine the source of the high bacterial densities.”

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language consistent with the requirements in the previous Order.

11. Page D-11, VIII.B.13., On the second to last line, change the word reclaimed to recycled as this water quality level has been redefined per the permitted use under Order No. 94-82.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

12. Page D-12, VIII.C.2., This section outlines laboratory requirements for usage in compliance monitoring. MRWPCA as required by the current and proposed Orders subscribes to the regional monitoring program identified as CCLEAN. This program uses cutting edge technology and laboratory techniques to answer important and complicated questions related to receiving water monitoring. Limiting the laboratories that can be used for this program is counterintuitive. Therefore, MRWPCA recommends the following changes: *“Water quality analyses performed in order to monitor compliance with this permit shall be by a laboratory certified by the State Department of Health Services for the constituent(s) being analyzed. Bioassay(s) performed in order to monitor compliance with this permit shall be in accord with guidelines approved by the State Water Resources Control Board and the State Department of Fish and Game. If the laboratory used or proposed for use by the discharger is not certified by the California Department of Health Services or, where appropriate, the Department of Fish and Game due to restrictions in the State's laboratory certification program, the discharger shall be considered in compliance with this provision provided:*

- a. Data results remain consistent with results of samples analyzed by the Central Coast Water Board;*
- b. A quality assurance program is used at the laboratory, including a manual containing steps followed in this program that is available for inspections by the staff of the Central Coast Water Board; and,*
- c. Certification is pursued in good faith and obtained as soon as possible after the program is reinstated.”*

This proposed language is directly from the current Order R3-2008-0008.

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. The requirements contained in this Order for the regional monitoring program identified as CCLEAN are consistent with those required of other facilities participating in the CCLEAN program and is a Central Coast Water Board Standard Provision.

13. Page D-15, VIII.G.2., This section lists phenolic compounds as a comparative result based on a “grab sample.” There are phenolic compounds in the remaining priority pollutants list (Table E-5) which would be tested with a high volume water sample per Table E-4. This issue requires clarification from RWQCB staff.

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. The requirements contained in this Order for the regional monitoring program identified as CCLEAN are consistent with those required of other facilities participating in the CCLEAN program.

14. Page D-15, VIII.G.4.a., Attachment D has had the titles “Federal” removed in previous sections, therefore we recommend that “Federal” be deleted from this location as well for continuity.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

15. Page D-18, VIII.G.23., Attachment D has had the titles “Federal” removed in previous sections, therefore we recommend that “Federal” be deleted from this location as well for continuity.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

16. Page E-3, Table E-1, The MRWPCA has over time proven that whole effluent disinfection is not necessary and no longer has the physical capacity to chlorinate and dechlorinate. We recommend that monitoring location EFF-001 be described as: *“Location where representative sample of effluent, which includes any component of brine waste, discharged through the ocean outfall can be collected, after treatment and chlorination/dechlorination and before contact with receiving water.”*

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

17. Page E-7, V.A., The approved laboratory that MRWPCA currently employs has proven that our effluent can comply with the acute toxicity objectives at full strength therefore making the serial dilutions irrelevant. We recommend adding the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph: *“If the acute toxicity objective can be met with full strength samples, the need for serial dilutions becomes unnecessary.”*

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. The toxicity requirements contained in this Order are consistent with those required of similar facilities and consistent with U.S. EPA guidance on toxicity testing.

18. Page E-8, V.A/B., Chronic Toxicity should be under heading “B.”

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

19. Page E-9, V.B., The last paragraph above Table E-7 identifies the speciation tests for chronic toxicity. We recommend that RWQCB staff clarify whether these tests need to be completed at least once every permit cycle or if past results can continue to be used.

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. The toxicity requirements contained in this Order are consistent with those required of similar facilities and consistent with U.S. EPA guidance on toxicity testing.

20. Page E-10, V.B., The last paragraph states: *“If chronic toxicity is measured above 115 TUC, the Discharger shall re-sample and submit the results to the Central Coast Water Board as described in section V.C.2.a of this Order.”* Section V.C.2.a. is related to Toxicity Reduction Requirements which was defined in the previous Order. The 115 TUC numerical limit however is not based on Table 5 of the Order within section III.A.1.b. as was specified in the Order R3-2008-0008. We request that RWQCB staff identify where and how the 115 TUC numerical limit was generated.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment. The value in the draft Order was incorrect and the correct value of 115 TUC has been inserted.

21. Page E-11, VII., Change the word reclaimed to recycled as this water quality level has been redefined per the permitted use under Order No. 94-82.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

22. Page E-13, IX.A.2., On the fourth line add: “Central Coast Water Board...”

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

23. Page E-17, IX.B.3.e.2., Change the word filed to field.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

24. Page E-19, Table 10, Line 3 related to Semi-Annual Monitoring please change these dates from May 1st and November 1st to February 1st and August 1st to coincide with our current monitoring schedule.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

25. Page E-19, Table 10, Line 4 change the SMR due date to the following: “Semi-Annual report submittal following the period of monitoring (following sampling as described in footnote 14 table E-4)”.

Staff Response: Edits were not made to the Order. The dates specified in Table 10 align with the Annual Report submittal dates. There are specific dates for all other due date periods (monthly, quarterly, annually).

26. Page E-19, Table 10, Line 6 change the SMR due date to the following: "*February 1st following calendar year of sampling inspection*"

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

27. Page E-19, X.B.4.b., In the second paragraph fourth line inside the parentheses, should the "+" should be a "±"? If not, can the RWQCB staff explain this?

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

28. Page F-4, I.A. Paragraph 1, line 4, Rey in Del Rey Oaks is spelled with an "e" not an "a."

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

29. Page F-3, Table F-1. Facility Information; change the Facility Permitted Flow and Facility Design Flow to 29.6 MGD Average Dry Weather Flow. Please change the Receiving Waters to state: "*Pacific Ocean (Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, outside the Zone of Prohibition)*".

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

30. Page F-4, II.A. Paragraph 1, second to last line, "... 29.6 MGD average dry weather flow and currently treats approximately 2418 MGD."

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

31. Page F-4, II.A. Paragraph 2, line 5, "...~~reclaimed~~recycled..."

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

32. Page F-5, II.A. Paragraph 4, lines 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10, "...~~reclaimed~~recycled..."

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

33. Page F-5, II.B. Paragraph 1, At the end of this paragraph include the following sentence: "*The MRWPCA outfall/diffuser system is located outside the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Zone of Prohibition.*"

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

34. Page F-11, II.B/E. Planned Changes should be under the heading “E” not “B”.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

35. Page F-11, II.E., Brine Disposal, Paragraph 1, lines 4 and 9, “...~~reclaimed~~
recycled...”

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

36. Page F-11, II.E., Brine Disposal, Paragraph 1, line 5 MRWPCA should include a “M”.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

37. Page F-11, II.E., Brine Disposal, Paragraph 2, line 2, “...~~reclamation~~recycling...”

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

38. Page F-11, II.E., Brine Disposal, Paragraph 2, line 3, “...~~reclaimed~~recycled...”

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

39. Page F-24, Table F-8 Title needs to be relocated to represent Table F-8.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

40. Page F-25, The Definition for Dm within the calculation states that Dm = 114 but the initial dilution for MRWPCA is 145 as stated just below the Dm definition on Page F-25. RWQCB staff needs to clarify and/or correct this difference.

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

41. Page F-38, VIII.A. “...through the following *posting in the Salinas Californian on February 26th, 2014.*”

Staff Response: Central Coast Water Board staff concurs with the comment and has made the editorial correction of language.

C. Public Hearing

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

Date: **May 22-23, 2014**
Time: **8:30 a.m.**
Location: **Central Coast Water Board**
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Central Coast Water Board voted to keep this permit on the consent calendar, and there was no objection by the discharger or the public.

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

D. Waste Discharge Requirements Petitions

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

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

E. Information and Copying

The Report of Waste Discharge (RWD), related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special provisions, comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Central Coast Water Board by calling (805) 549-3147.

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 Coast 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 Peter von Langen at (805) 549-3688 or pvonlangen@waterboards.ca.gov or Sheila Soderberg at (805) 542-3592 or Sheila.Soderberg@waterboards.ca.gov.