

# **EXHIBIT H**

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY ORDER R5-2010-0505  
IN THE MATTER OF**

**THE CITY OF CHICO  
CHICO WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT  
BUTTE COUNTY**

This Order is issued to the City of Chico (hereafter referred to as Discharger) pursuant to California Water Code (CWC) section 13385, which authorizes the imposition of Administrative Civil Liability (ACL). This Order is based on findings that the Discharger violated provisions of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order R5-2004-0073 (NPDES No. CA0079081).

The Executive Officer of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (hereafter Central Valley Water Board) finds, with respect to the Discharger's acts, or failure to act, the following:

1. The Discharger owns and operates the Chico Water Pollution Control Plant (CWPCP), which provides sewerage service to the community of Chico. Treated municipal/industrial wastewater is discharged to the Sacramento River, a water of the United States.
2. On 4 June 2004, the Central Valley Water Board issued the Discharger WDRs Order R5-2004-0073, which regulates discharges of waste from the CWPCP.
3. On 17 March 2009, the Assistant Executive Officer issued the Discharger Administrative Civil Liability Complaint R5-2009-0523 (Complaint), which charged the Discharger with Administrative Civil Liability in the amount of \$153,000, pursuant to CWC section 13385. The amount of the liability for the discharge violations was established based upon a review of the factors cited in CWC section 13385, which is described in Finding No. 25.

**PREVIOUS ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS**

4. On 17 March 2008, the Central Valley Water Board issued Complaint R5-2008-0509, charging the Discharger with administrative civil liability of \$100,000 for effluent chlorine residual violations from incidents on 21 August 2007 and 4 September 2007. The complaint indicated that approximately 3.124 million gallons of secondary treated effluent, which was not properly chlorinated or dechlorinated, was discharged to the Sacramento River due to electrical power problems with the chemical feed supply system. The duration of the 21 August 2007 and 4 September 2007 incidents was approximately 11 hours. On

2 December 2008, the Central Valley Water Board issued Administrative Liability Order R5-2008-0593, requiring the Discharger to submit a check for \$31,981 to the Central Valley Water Board, and to complete a Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP) for the remaining amount of the Order (\$68,019). The SEP consists of a Water Quality and Citizen Monitoring Program for the Big Chico Creek drainage. The SEP will be completed by 1 April 2010. The Central Valley Water Board has accepted payment from the Discharger of the penalty associated with ACL Complaint R5-2008-0509, and will consider this matter resolved upon receiving a report detailing the expenditure of at least \$68,019 on the SEP.

5. On 15 May 2007, the Central Valley Water Board issued ACL Complaint R5-2007-0512. Pursuant to CWC section 13385(h), a mandatory penalty of \$3,000 was imposed due to effluent chlorine residual violations from an incident on 9 December 2006. ACL Complaint R5-2007-0512 indicated that approximately 388,180 gallons of effluent, which was not properly chlorinated and /or dechlorinated, was discharged to the Sacramento River due to electrical power problems with the chemical feed supply system. The Central Valley Water Board has accepted payment from the Discharger of the penalty associated with ACL Complaint R5-2007-0512, and considers this prior matter resolved.
6. On 19 July 2005, the Central Valley Water Board issued ACL Complaint R5-2005-0520. Pursuant to CWC section 13385(h), a mandatory penalty of \$9,000 was imposed due to effluent chlorine residual violations from several incidents that occurred on 14 March 2004, 24 July 2004, and 16 March 2005. ACL Complaint R5-2005-0520 indicated that effluent, which was not properly chlorinated and /or dechlorinated, was discharged to the Sacramento River due to electrical and mechanical failures with the chemical feed supply system. The Central Valley Water Board has accepted payment from the Discharger of the penalty associated with ACL Complaint R5-2005-0520, and considers this prior matter resolved.
7. On 19 February 2004, the Central Valley Water Board issued ACL Complaint R5-2004-0500. Pursuant to CWC section 13385(h), a mandatory penalty of \$15,000 was imposed due to effluent chlorine residual violations from several incidents that occurred on 16 October 2002, 5 April 2003, 1 May 2003, 7 November 2003, and 29 January 2004. ACL Complaint R5-2004-0500 indicated that effluent, which was not properly chlorinated and /or dechlorinated, was discharged to the Sacramento River due to electrical and mechanical failures with the chemical feed supply system. The Central Valley Water Board has accepted payment from the Discharger of the penalty associated with ACL Complaint R5-2002-0500, and considers this prior matter resolved.
8. On 24 July 2002, the Central Valley Water Board issued ACL Complaint R5-2002-0515. Pursuant to CWC section 13385(h), a mandatory penalty of \$9,000 was imposed due to effluent chlorine residual violations from several

incidents that occurred on 24 January 2002, 25 January 2002, and 30 June 2002. ACL Complaint R5-2002-0515 indicated that effluent, which was not properly chlorinated and /or dechlorinated, was discharged to the Sacramento River due to mechanical and electrical failures with the chemical feed supply system. The Central Valley Water Board has accepted payment from the Discharger of the penalty associated with ACL Complaint R5-2002-0515, and considers this prior matter resolved.

9. On 29 November 2000, the Central Valley Water Board issued ACL Complaint R5-2000-0528. Pursuant to CWC section 13385(h), a mandatory penalty of \$6,000 was imposed due to effluent chlorine residual violations from several incidents that occurred on 1 January 2000 and 28 February 2000. The complaint indicated that effluent, which was not properly chlorinated and /or dechlorinated, was discharged to the Sacramento River due to mechanical and electrical failures with the chemical feed supply system. The Central Valley Water Board has accepted payment from the Discharger of the penalty associated with ACLC R5-2000-0528, and considers this prior matter resolved.

**DISCHARGE VIOLATIONS**

10. WDRs Order R5-2004-0073 contains the following Discharge Prohibition that was violated when the Discharger discharged partially-treated wastewater to the Sacramento River:

Discharge Prohibition A.1:

1. Discharge of treated wastewater at allocation or in a manner different from that described in Findings Nos. 2, 3 and 4 is prohibited.

Finding No. 4:

The treatment system consists of screening for removal of large solids, grit removal, primary clarification, activated sludge treatment with secondary clarification, and chlorination/dechlorination.

11. WDRs Order R5-2004-0073 contains the following effluent limitations that were violated by the Discharger by discharging the partially-treated wastewater to the Sacramento River:

Effluent Limitation B.1:

1. Effluent shall not exceed the following limits at Discharge 001:

<u>Constituents</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Monthly Average</u>	<u>Weekly Average</u>	<u>Monthly Median</u>	<u>4-day Average</u>	<u>Daily Maximum</u>
Chlorine Residual	mg/L	--	--	--	0.01	0.02 <sup>c</sup>
<sup>c</sup> 1-hour average						

**16/17 May 2008 Incident**

12. On 16 May 2008, sodium hypochlorite tanks at the CWPCP were changed out in the evening. Sometime after the crew went home for day, these tanks lost prime and ceased discharging sodium hypochlorite to the chlorine contact basin. Sodium hypochlorite treatment is an important part of the disinfection process that disinfects the secondary wastewater (removing pathogens/coliform) prior to the dechlorination process.
13. The Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system did not indicate an alarm condition because the "set-point" was set at 0.00 mg/L of chlorine. The continuous residual chlorine analyzer "flat-lined" at 0.1 mg/L of chlorine, therefore it did not trigger an alarm. The sodium hypochlorite was not being discharged to the chlorine contact basin from 5:00pm (16 May 2008) to 7:40am (17 May 2008). By 5:40 pm (16 May 2008) sodium hypochlorite was not present in the effluent flow. When the operator on weekend duty noticed the absence of residual chlorine in the initial residual chlorine analyzer, he immediately began diverting the flow to the emergency holding pond. On 18 May 2008, the Discharger notified the Central Valley Water Board of the incident. On 19 May 2008, the Discharger collected a sample of the wastewater that was stored in the emergency treatment ponds (after being diverted on 17 May 2008), and the results indicated >1,600 MPN/100 mL of total coliform.
14. Approximately 4.7 million gallons of secondary-treated effluent that did not receive any disinfection with sodium hypochlorite was discharged to the Sacramento River over a 16-hour timeframe between 16 May 2008 and 17 May 2008, in violation of WDRs Order R5-2004-0073, Discharge Prohibition A.1.

#### **15 June 2008 Incident**

15. On 15 June 2008, a malfunctioning programmable logic controller (PLC) in the chemical feed building caused a significant amount of flow to be discharged without receiving full treatment, in violation of WDRs Order R5-2004-0073, Discharge Prohibition A.1. The PLC was cycling on and off every couple of seconds. This caused the chemical feed pumps to remain off due to the lack of a continuous signal from the PLC. The malfunction caused the sodium hypochlorite and the sodium bisulfite pumps to stop feeding chemicals to the secondary treated unit. When the PLC malfunctioned, the alarm dialer initiated an alarm call out sequence to the plant operators. The plant operator diverted the effluent to the plant emergency storage ponds approximately 23 minutes after the pumps had been shut down.
16. Approximately 113,000 gallons of secondary treated effluent that did not receive any disinfection with sodium hypochlorite was discharged to the Sacramento River for a 23-minute time span in which the plant effluent decreased from 1.92 mg/L of chlorine to 1.58 mg/L of chlorine. The maximum daily residual chlorine (based on 1-hr averages) for the incident was 0.08 mg/L of chlorine.

17. In the past nine years, there have been approximately sixteen separate effluent violations of residual chlorine. The majority of the events have been related to electrical failure problems with the chemical feed system electronics. There have been a total of \$142,000 mandatory minimum penalties assessed during the last seven years.
18. In summary, during May and June 2008, the Discharger violated the total residual chlorine effluent limitations set forth in Effluent Limitations B.1 for 113,000 gallons, and violated Discharge Prohibition A.1 for 4.7 million gallons of effluent (not properly chlorinated/dechlorinated). A total of approximately 4.813 million gallons of partially treated secondary treated effluent were discharged to the Sacramento River in violation of WDRs Order R5-2004-0073.

## REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

19. CWC section 13376 states, in part:

Any person discharging pollutants or proposing to discharge pollutants to the navigable waters of the United States ... shall file a report of the discharge in compliance with the procedures set forth in Section 13260..." and "The discharge of pollutants...except as authorized by waste discharge requirements [NPDES permit]...is prohibited.

20. CWC section 13385 states, in part:

(a) Any person who violates any of the following shall be liable civilly in accordance with subdivisions (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f):

...  
(2) Any waste discharge requirements ... issued pursuant to this chapter ...  
...

(c) Civil liability may be imposed administratively by the state board or a regional board pursuant to Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 13323) of Chapter 5 in an amount not to exceed the sum of both the following:

(1) Ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) for each day in which the violation occurs.

(2) Where there is a discharge, any portion of which is not susceptible to cleanup or is not cleaned up, and the volume discharged but not cleaned up exceeds 1,000 gallons, an additional liability not to exceed ten dollars (\$10) times the number of gallons by which the volume discharged but not cleaned up exceeds 1,000 gallons."

21. The Discharger has violated WDRs Order R5-2004-0073 by violating effluent limitations and by discharging waste to surface waters without the proper treatment, which includes chlorination and dechlorination. WDRs Order R5-2004-0073 was issued by the Board pursuant to Chapter 5.5 of the CWC, and therefore, the Board may impose liability upon the Discharger pursuant to CWC section 13385 for the violations.

#### **CALCULATION OF PENALTY FOR DISCHARGE VIOLATIONS**

22. The maximum administrative civil liability which can be imposed by the Central Valley Water Board under CWC section 13385 is \$10,000 per day per violation plus \$10 per gallon discharged in excess of 1,000 gallons not subject to clean up. As stated in Finding No. 18, approximately 4.813 million gallons of undisinfected secondary-treated wastewater were discharged to the Sacramento River on 16 and 17 of May and 15 June 2008. The maximum administrative civil liability is \$30,000 (3 days times \$10,000 per day of violation) plus \$48,119,000 (4.813 million gallons minus 1,000 gallons for each discharge not subject to cleanup multiplied by \$10 per gallon), for a **total maximum liability of \$48,149,000.**
23. CWC section 13385(e) states:

In determining the amount of any liability imposed under this section, the regional board ... shall take into account the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation or violations, whether the discharge is susceptible to cleanup or abatement, the degree of toxicity of the discharge, and, with respect to the violator, the ability to pay, the effect on its ability to continue its business, any voluntary cleanup efforts undertaken, any prior history of violations, the degree of culpability, economic benefit or savings, if any, resulting from the violation, and other matters that justice may require. At a minimum, liability shall be assessed at a level that recovers the economic benefits, if any, derived from the acts that constitute the violation.
24. Pursuant to CWC section 13385(e), the minimum administrative civil liability the Board may impose is equivalent to the economic benefit accrued by the Discharger for not implementing management and/or physical improvements necessary to prevent the discharges. The 4.813 million-gallon discharges were the result of the Discharger's failure to provide adequate control measures to prevent fluctuations of the programmable logic controller and/or the SCADA system properly registering alarms due to the low residual alarm point on the residual chlorine analyzer. Economic benefit is estimated to be at least as much as the amount that the Discharger saved in one year by not hiring an after-hours operator. The Board believes that if personnel were onsite during all peak flow periods, they would have been able to divert the flow of effluent to the three-holding/oxidation ponds, instead of the Sacramento River.

The Discharger may have saved at least **\$52,657 - 70,565** by not taking the

actions required to prevent the violations described in this Complaint. This savings is based on a cost estimate of providing for a Grade III WWTP operator. This operator could have been present during the non-working hours of the CWPCP (evenings and weekends). Cost estimates have been obtained from a City of Chico 2007-2008 Summary of Salaries. This indicates an annual salary of approximately \$52,657.00 to \$70,565.42 per year for a WWTP Operator Grade III to be at the plant and to take action when alarm conditions occur and/or when the alarm system malfunctions. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, title 23, section 3680, in Class II, III, and IV plants, supervisors and shift supervisors shall possess valid operator certificates no more than one grade lower than the class of plant operated. The Plant is a Grade IV wastewater treatment plant, therefore a Grade III Operator as a shift supervisor would have been needed on weekend and evenings. Therefore, the minimum liability for the two occurrences is in the range of \$52,657 to \$70,565.

25. The following table contains the factors that were considered pursuant to CWC section 13385(e) in setting the initial penalty amount:

Factor	Consideration
Nature, Circumstances, Extent, and Gravity of the Violations	The Discharger has violated WDRs Order R5-004-0073 by discharging partially-treated wastewater to the Sacramento River. A total of 113,000 gallons of discharged wastewater violated the total residual chlorine effluent limitation, and 4.7 million gallons of discharged wastewater was not properly disinfected.
Degree of Culpability	The Discharger has had several enforcement actions against it for similar occurrences. In the last 9 years, there has been \$142,000 in penalties assessed for sixteen violations.
Voluntary Cleanup Efforts	There was no cleanup of the discharged wastewater. When the Discharger noticed the effluent violations, it diverted the wastewater discharge into the onsite emergency storage ponds.
Susceptibility to Cleanup or Abatement	The total amount of partially-treated wastewater is not susceptible to cleanup. By the time the violations were corrected, the partially-treated wastewater was most likely diluted in the receiving water.
Degree of Toxicity of the Discharge	The discharge on 15 June 2008 had a total chlorine residual of up to 1.92 mg/L, which could have been toxic to the organisms in the immediate vicinity of the discharge. The Discharger did not notice any fish kills downstream of the discharge.
Prior History of Violations	See Findings Nos. 4-9. The Discharger's history of violations did not mitigate the penalty amount, because the Discharger was on notice of the problems prior to the violations that are the subject of this Order.
Economic Benefit or Savings Resulting from the Violation	See Finding No. 24 for a discussion of this factor.
Ability to Pay	The Discharger is a municipality that charges fees for services provided. The Discharger has not submitted evidence of inability to pay the penalty.

Factor	Consideration
Other Matters that Justice May Require	Staff costs for responding to the violations are approximately \$10,000.

26. The monthly sewage rate for the City of Chico is approximately \$16.11/mth (based on May 2008 data). A review of other similar wastewater facilities in Butte County, indicate that the average monthly sewage fee is approximately \$21.51/mth (or \$5.40/mth more than CWPCP).
27. CWC section 13385 states, in part:
- (l)(1) In lieu of assessing penalties pursuant to subdivision (h) or (i), the state board or the regional board, with the concurrence of the discharger, may direct a portion of the penalty amount to be expended on a supplemental environmental project in accordance with the enforcement policy of the state board. If the penalty amount exceeds fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000), the portion of the penalty amount that may be directed to be expended on a supplemental environmental project may not exceed fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) plus 50 percent of the penalty amount that exceeds fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000).
- (2) For the purposes of this section, a "supplemental environmental project" means an environmentally beneficial project that a person agrees to undertake, with the approval of the regional board, that would not be undertaken in the absence of an enforcement action under this section.
28. On 18 June 2009, the Discharger submitted a letter proposing to fund the Big Chico Creek Water Quality and Citizen Monitoring Program as a supplemental environmental project (SEP) to offset a portion of the administrative civil liability. The proposed water quality monitoring program has a total budget of \$75,000 and will be administered by Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance. The proposed project would support a significant monitoring effort through 2010, and will include monitoring objectives to closely track the effects of land use practices on water quality, within the Big Chico Watershed Area.
- The Central Valley Water Board's Prosecution Team finds that the Discharger's proposal is complies with the terms of the State Water Board's Policy for Supplemental Environmental Projects. Details of the SEP are provided in Attachment A, a part of this Order.
29. Issuance of this Administrative Civil Order is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Pub. Resources Code § 21000, et seq.), in accordance with California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 15321 (a)(2).
30. On 23 April 2009, the Central Valley Water Board delegated the authority to issue Administrative Civil Liability Orders, where the matter is not contested by the Discharger, to the Executive Officer (Resolution R5-2009-0027).

31. This Order constitutes a settlement of the violations alleged in Administrative Civil Liability Complaint R5-2009-0523. Notice of this settlement will be published on the Central Valley Water Board's website, and will be provided to all interested parties. This Order becomes final upon expiration of the 30-day public notice and comment period mandated by Federal regulations (40 CFR 123.27) and upon signature.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that administrative civil liability of \$153,000 shall be imposed by the Central Valley Water Board as follows:

1. **Within 30 days of this Order becoming final**, the Discharger shall pay \$78,000 by check, which shall contain a reference to "ACL Order R5-2010-0505" and shall be made payable to the *State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account*.
2. Attachment A, a part of this Order, describes the Big Chico Creek Watershed SEP, which has been proposed by the Discharger. Attachment A includes a project description, a series of deadlines, and an estimated budget. The Central Valley Water Board hereby suspends \$75,000 of the assessed administrative civil liability, pending completion of the SEP. Upon satisfactory completion of the SEP, the suspended portion of the administrative civil liability shall be dismissed.
3. The Discharger must obtain explicit approval from the Executive Officer for any significant departures from the project description contained in Attachment A. Failure to obtain approval for any significant departures may result in the assessment of the full amount of the suspended civil liabilities.

The Executive Officer may extend the deadlines in Attachment A if the Discharger demonstrates that unforeseeable contingencies have created delays, provided that the Discharger continues to undertake all appropriate measures to meet the deadlines. The Discharger shall make any deadline extension in advance of the deadline, and the request shall be in writing. Any extension request not replied to in writing shall be deemed denied.

Should the Executive Officer reasonably conclude that the Discharger is not making progress implementing the SEP, the Executive Officer may demand payment of the difference between the \$75,000 suspended by this Order and the amount that the Discharger has already expended. The Discharger shall remit payment within 30 days of such a demand.

4. **By 1 April 2011**, the Discharger shall provide a final report documenting completion of the supplemental environmental project as described in Attachment A of this Order, and proof of expenditures totaling at least \$75,000 on the SEP. Should the Discharger spend less than \$75,000 on the implementation

of the SEP, the remaining balance shall be due by 30 April 2011, and shall be made by check, which shall contain a reference to "ACL Order R5-2010-0505" and shall be made payable to the *State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account*.

Though the Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance will implement the SEP, the Discharger maintains ultimate responsibility that the SEP is completed in a timely manner and that all project deadlines are met.

Any person aggrieved by this action of the Central Valley Water Board may petition the State Water Board to review the action in accordance with CWC section 13320 and California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 2050 and following. The State Water Board must receive the petition by 5:00 p.m., 30 days after the date this Order becomes final, except that if the thirtieth day following the date of this Order falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or state holiday, the petition must be received by the State Water Board by 5:00 p.m. on the next business day. Copies of the law and regulations applicable to filing petitions may be found on the Internet at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public\\_notices/petitions/water\\_quality](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality)  
or will be provided upon request.

*Original signed by: Kenneth D. Landau for*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
28 January 2010

Date

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT TO ADDRESS ADMINISTRATIVE CIVIL LIABILITY COMPLAINT R5-2009-0523**

#### **BIG CHICO CREEK WATERSHED ALLIANCE BIG CHICO CREEK WATER QUALITY AND CITIZEN MONITORING PROGRAM**

##### **A. PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Big Chico Creek watershed is located in a region that includes the interface between the Sierra Nevada Range to the south, and the remnant volcanic flows of the Cascade Range to the north. Headwaters originate from cold-water springs on Colby Mountain and flow 45 miles to its confluence with the Sacramento River. Watershed elevation ranges from about 120 feet at the mouth to 6000 feet on Colby Mountain. The watershed also encompasses three smaller sub-drainages to the north: Sycamore, Mud, and Rock (ECR, 1998). The underlying geology includes areas where the creek cuts through Tuscan layers important in the recharge of the Lower Tuscan aquifer, which is being explored for a regional conjunctive use project.

The Big Chico Creek watershed has been modified for flood control, suffers impacts from urban population increases, and has lost important riparian habitat in its agricultural areas, yet still supports spring run salmon spawning and rearing and fall run rearing near the Sacramento River, as well as western pond turtle, foothill yellow-legged frog and other sensitive species.

The watershed also includes urban, suburban, rural residential, orchard, rangeland, and forestry land uses. These diverse and localized impacts of land use are sometimes difficult to detect and information collected over a long temporal scale is important to determine variations due strictly to land use practices. Citizen monitoring groups are perfect for collecting information needed to determine long-term trends in stream habitat quality as a function of diverse land use.

The proposed project, which will be implemented by the Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance (Alliance) intends to assess and monitor water quality in the Big Chico Creek Watershed through a multi-pronged approach which engages community members in monitoring efforts, compiles and analyzes data collected, and provides education and outreach to promote understanding and action related to watershed health. The project will implement and extend a successful citizen monitoring program in which the Alliance has already worked closely with the City of Chico and other partners. This project will continue to be managed and guided with the leadership of expert staff. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) with both state level and relevant local expertise and content knowledge, will provide recommendations for reviewing and updating existing Monitoring Plan (MP) and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP).

Volunteers will be recruited and coordinated in Street Teams to participate in the monitoring activities. Training will be provided for identified Teams using last year's updated Volunteer Monitoring Manual, and will include standard methods and sampling protocols, and correct use of equipment. This

ensures data quality objectives are met and that data integrity is consistent with the previous four years of data from the Alliance's Citizen Monitoring Program.

Utilizing the schedule and parameters outlined in the MP, watershed monitoring activities will be conducted at 10 established monitoring stations. Multiple surveys collect data to track chemical physical and biological parameters to assess water condition. Additionally, continuous water temperature and storm event monitoring are conducted. Field and Laboratory testing will be consistent with an updated MP and QAPP.

Stream Teams meet regularly to conduct ongoing water monitoring efforts during May through October, collecting relevant project data. Additional monitoring events are scheduled according to the MP and include bioassessment, storm event and post restoration site surveys. The Alliance has most of the existing water testing equipment available for use; however some updated monitoring equipment kits and supplies (e.g. batteries and calibration fluids) will be required. The Stream Teams are a part of the project educational outreach that provides the training of the volunteers, teachers, and students who conduct the water quality monitoring. Teachers and students from at least three local schools participate in the monitoring activities.

In 2010, the Alliance proposes to plan and facilitate four (4) public meetings to inform the public of the Citizen Monitoring program results, trends, and effectiveness. The meetings will be organized and facilitated by the Alliance's Watershed Coordinator during the first year in different venues and formats to broaden the awareness of both the City's efforts in supporting a Citizen Monitoring program and highlight community action to improve water quality.

Electronic information distribution will be supported through the Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance website. Project data reports, maps, monitoring schedules and educational information will be posted quarterly. This electronic information will be highlighted in the four public meetings so that the public knows where to further seek water quality information on a consistent basis.

## **B. REPORTING DEADLINES**

The State Water Board's Policy on Supplemental Environmental Projects states that all Orders allowing Supplemental Environmental Projects must, "Require periodic reporting (quarterly reporting at a minimum) on the performance of the SEP by the discharger to the Water Board to monitor the timely and successful completion of the SEP. Copies of the periodic reports must be provided to the Division of Financial Assistance of the State Water Board."

### **Quarterly Reports:**

- Due **1 January, 1 April, 1 July, 1 October** of each project year.
- Shall contain a summary of project actions taken up to the current date
- Shall contain a basic accounting of costs expended on the SEP to the current date

### **Final Report:**

- Due **1 April 2011** (no quarterly report due on this date)

- Shall contain a project summary
- Shall contain a final accounting of costs expended on the SEP

**C. PROPOSED PROJECT BUDGET**

**BIG CHICO CREEK WATER QUALITY AND CITIZENS MONITORING PROGRAM BUDGET**

<b>REVENUE</b>		<b>\$ 75,000</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>		
<b>I.</b>	<b>Personnel Costs</b>	
a.	BCCWA Watershed Coordinator	\$ 14,500
	Subtotal	\$ 14,500
b.	Benefits	\$ 5,299
	<b>Total Personnel Costs</b>	<b>\$ 19,799</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Operating Expenses</b>	
a.	Supplies, Telephone, Copying, Postage	\$ 600
b.	Travel and Conference	\$ 600
c.	Operating Expenses, accounting, insurance, etc	\$ 2,500
d.	Meeting Expenses, Equipment and Facility rental	\$ 1,200
e.	Sub Contractors & Project Operations incl.	\$ 32,680
	Sub Contractor Operating Expenses	\$ 6,550
	Monitoring Equipment & Lab Cost	\$ 7,500
	<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 51,630</b>
	<b>Subtotal Personnel/Operate Exp.</b>	<b>\$ 71,429</b>
	<b>BCCWA overhead expense at 4%</b>	<b>\$ 3,571</b>
	<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$ 75,000</b>

**PROPOSED PROJECT TASKS AND ACTIVITIES**

<b>TASKS AND ACTIVITIES WITH TIME DESIGNATION</b>	<b>HOURS</b>
<b>Task 1. Project Management</b>	
1.1 Prepare Project Progress Reports	120
1.2 Prepare Project Final Reports	75

	subtotal	205
<b>Task 2. Revise Monitoring Plan and QAPP</b>		
2.1	Update Monitoring Plan and QAPP	85
2.1	TAC Meeting Facilitation and Recommendation Integration	15
2.3	Landowner Access Agreements	10
	subtotal	110
<b>Task 3 Community Outreach and Partnership Development</b>		
3.1	Develop outreach materials	110
3.2	Website update and maps	100
3.3	Participate in broad community collaboration to highlight project: Endangered Species Fair, Snow Goose Festival, volunteer picnic	100
3.4	Coordinate and host four Citizen Monitoring specific meetings	140
	subtotal	450
<b>Task 4. Training</b>		
4.1	Develop training schedules	30
4.2	Update Volunteer Monitoring Manual	10
4.3	Recruit participants and conduct trainings	135
	subtotal	175
<b>Task 5. Conduct Watershed Monitoring</b>		
5.1	Update and maintain equipment and supplies	60
5.2	Conduct Monitoring	270
5.3	Analyze data and update database	40
5.4	Prepare Data Progress Reports	60
5.5	Prepare Annual Data Report	80
	subtotal	510
<b>Sub Contractor Task and Activities</b>		<b>Total Hours</b>
		<b>1,450</b>
<b>Citizen Volunteers</b>		<b>(In Kind Contribution)</b>
		<b>500</b>

U:\Clerical Documents\Draft\_Staff\_to\_Clerical\South Unit\Greg\chico-WPCP R5-2010-0505.doc